DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 090 HE 003 938

AUTHOR	Tubbs, Walter E. Jr., Ed.
TITLE	Toward a Community of Seekers: A Report on Experimental Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Nebraska Univ., Lincoln. Curriculum Development Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 72
NOTE	305p.; Proceedings of the Johnston College National Symposium on Experimental Higher Education, January, 1972
AVAILABLE FROM	Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, University of Nebraska, Andrews Hall, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508 (Free)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$13.16
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; Educational Administration; Educational Finance; Educational Improvement; *Educational Innovation; Evaluation; *Experimental Colleges; Experimental Curriculum; Experimental Programs; *Experimental Teaching; *Higher Education; Program Evaluation; Student Interests; *Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS	*National Symposium Experimental Higher Education

ABSTRACT

Many experimental higher education programs have emerged in the past decade as an attempt to answer the educational needs of new students in higher education and the manpower requirements of society. New techniques of instruction, curriculum and governance have evolved and new ways of managing human, plant, and financial resources have been pursued. The National Symposium on Experimental Higher Education, of which this document is a report, sought to identify what kinds of experimental programs are in operation, what problems they have encountered, and what answers have evolved for the benefit of higher education as a whole. Presentations and panels at the Symposium included: (1) New Enterprises in Higher Education: Evaluation of Innovation; (2) Evaluation of Experimental Higher Education; (3) Power and Decisionmaking in Experimental Colleges; (4) The Dynamics of Interdisciplinary Departments and Problem Solving as a Teaching Techniques; (5) Minority Students and the Experimental College; (6) Off-Campus Education; (7) Cooperative Education Programs; (8) Alternatives for Financing Higher Education; and (9) Participative Education. (HS)

ED 076090

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TOWARD
A
COMMUNITY OF SEEKERS:

A Report on
Experimental Higher Education

Johnston College National Symposium
on Experimental Higher Education
January, 1972

Edited by
WALTER E. TUBBS, JR.
Faculty Fellow in Neuropsychology and Philosophy
Johnston College

with a Foreword by FRANK NEWMAN
Director of Community Relations
Stanford University
and
Chairman, Presidential Task
Force on Higher Education

HE 003938

This work has developed under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However the content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of that agency, and no official endorsement of these materials should be inferred. Grant support was also received from the CBS Foundation of New York and the First Western Bank of Los Angeles.

Published by the Nebraska Curriculum
Development Center, University of Nebraska
December, 1972

Other related books published by the
Nebraska Curriculum Development Center:

Education for 1984 and After
The University Can't Train Teachers
Of Education and Human Community
Nothing But Praise

These books are available on request from the
Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, University of
Nebraska, Andrews Hall, Lincoln, Nebraska, 68508

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword by Frank Newman v

Preface viii

SESSION 1: TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION (Panel) 2
Josiah Bartlett
Paul Dressel
Conrad Hilberry
Harold Hodgkinson
Frank Newman

SESSION 2: NEW ENTERPRISES IN HIGHER EDUCATION: EVALUATION OF INNOVATION (Panel) 16
Harold Hodgkinson
Frank Newman

SESSION 3: EVALUATION OF EXPERIMENTAL HIGHER EDUCATION (Panel) 42
Donald Brown
Paul Dressel
Harold Hodgkinson
Robert Pace

SESSION 4: POWER AND DECISION-MAKING IN EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGES 66
Thomas Greening
Arthur Wiener

SESSION 5: PARTICIPATIVE EDUCATION 84
James Doxsey
Albert R. Wight

SESSION 6: THE DYNAMICS OF INTERDISCIPLINARY DEPARTMENTS AND PROBLEM SOLVING AS A TEACHING TECHNIQUE 128
James Kolka
Nelson Swinerton

SESSION 7: MINORITY STUDENTS AND THE EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE 162
Barbara Benavie
Alberto Nieto

SESSION 8: OFF-CAMPUS EDUCATION 186
James Clatsworthy
Bernard Fisken
Gale Fuller
Hugh Haggard
Kathryn Johnson
John Valley

SESSION 9: COMMUNITY INSIGHT: A NEW DIRECTION IN EDUCATION 202
Roger Baty
Alan Joplin

SESSION 10: COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS 222
John Chase
Allen Killpatrick
James Wilson

SESSION 11: ALTERNATIVES FOR FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION 234
Robert Leaver
John Wish

SESSION 12: THE HIGHER EDUCATION BILL: SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR EXPERIMENTING INSTITUTIONS 252
Clarence Leeds, III

APPENDICES
- I. Selected Summaries
  - Admissions in an Experimental College 266
  - University Without Walls 269
  - International Service Opportunities 270
  - University Year for Action 273
  - External Degrees 275
  - The Role of the Federal Government in Accreditation 279
- II. Notes on Contributors 281
- III. List of Experimental Colleges and Experimental Folk, and 1972 Symposium Participants 283

FOREWORD

It is always a temptation for individuals to view any given period of their lives as an age of transition. But in higher education in the early 1970's, there are compelling circumstances for believing this.

Throughout the 1950's and 1960's trends in higher education were consistent:

- — Society pressed for ever wider access to college for those graduating from high school.
- — Institutions struggled toward the higher orders of academic prestige, the ideal being represented by the research university.
- — Students sought credentials that opened the doors to the good life and particularly to interesting, high-paying jobs.

These trends assumed an unquestioning faith in the value of the college experience and an ever growing per cent of the Gross National Product devoted to higher education. It is clear to us now that it is no longer possible to continue on this traditional path. Access to college in some states has been widened to include more than 75 per cent of high-school graduates. Increasingly, the opportunity to attract new groups of students lies with very different parts of society—older students in particular. The very broad spectrum of students attending colleges has forced us to recognize that our current institutions cannot easily deal with such great diversity in personal needs, academic abilities, and learning style.

Institutions find it increasingly difficult to evolve toward the prestigious model of the research university, for the public is no longer willing to pay the heavy costs of this transformation. New tasks concerned with the quality of teaching, for which the research university has proven to be a less than suitable universal environment, are demanding our attention. Institutions now feel compelled to become more attractive to students by accentuating their differences and to society by making more effective use of their resources.

With the huge growth in numbers of those obtaining a college education, college graduates are no longer assured a place in society by virtue of their credential. More and more they are forced to think about education as a self-enlightening experience rather than as a meal ticket.

The blinders are off for all segments of society and higher education. We are more realistic about the glories and the problems of higher education. The result is a strong trend toward experimentation and, consequently, experimental institutions. Certainly no single approach to the experimental college can possibly resolve all of the problems that are evident to us in 1972. Many diverse types of learning will be required to meet the many different types of students. Experimental institutions need to learn from each other, however. One important thing that will be common to all is to learn that diversity in itself is not enough. Rather, it is important to be different *and effective.*

Traditionally organized institutions can exist and even remain acceptable though they function poorly in educating their students (especially as long as governments are willing to continue supplying money). But a new and differently organized institution must prove its worth — and rightly so.

We are now in a test period. The question is whether we have the ability to show the imagination necessary to develop new approaches, the willingness to set high standards, and the discipline to evaluate our experimental efforts against these standards.

Frank Newman

August 1972

PREFACE

In January of 1972, Johnston College, experimenting college of the University of Redlands, hosted the National Symposium on Experimental Higher Education. Over 300 people from 100 institutions attended the three-day symposium and engaged in lively—sometimes heated—debate over some 45 different topics.

In attendance at the symposium, in addition to the delegate teams, were prominent educators and researchers, including: Dr. Frank Newman of Stanford *("The Newman Report");* Dr. Harold Hodgkinson (Project Director, U. C. Berkeley Center for Research and Development in Higher Education); Mr. Richard Hays and Mr. Donald Crawford of the U .S. Office of Education; Dr. Paul Dressel of Michigan State University (author of *Evaluation in Higher Education);* Dr. Conrad Hilberry of Berea College (co-author with Morris Keeton of *Struggle and Promise: A Future for Colleges);* Dr. Robert Pace, Professor of Higher Education at U.C.L.A.; Dr. Josiah Bartlett of the Wright Institute and Dr. Donald Brown, University of Michigan.

The primary purpose of the symposium was to bring together people intimately involved in higher education for an intensive weekend of informal, free-wheeling, cards-on-the-table discussion. The emphasis was on practical discussion, free of jargon and defensiveness, about the challenges, achievements, and everyday problems of higher education in the United States—and particularly of experimental higher education.

As host for the symposium, Johnston College sought to do at least two things: (1) To provide a context and a climate in which some of the most innovative educators in the country could hammer out substantive, workable approaches on how to improve the vision, the goals, and the management of higher education in particular. (2) To make available in convenient form the best of the '72 symposium in order to enrich and inform the debate as it continues into the '73 symposium. The dynamic of the two-year design was thus to encourage, the first year, the spontaneous generation of material which could be packaged conveniently and used to formulate more seasoned judgments during the second round. This double-pronged approach was an effort to gain a longer, more concrete view of what is being said and done in experimental higher education—yet, to get beyond the excess of words typical of such conferences.

Higher education has in recent years been variously charged with inefficiency, irrelevance, and lack of creativity. Many of these charges are justified, and as a result educators are taking a hard look at improving ways of doing their complex jobs. One such group of educators may be thought of as the "research and development" specialists of American higher education. This is the group of experimenting colleges who are testing imaginative new (and hopefully better) ways of meeting students' and society's educational needs. It seems impractical, if not impossible, for a large education system or institution to revise its whole operation to try out a new idea. But the small experimenting colleges can do this and are doing it. Of course, it would be absurd to say that "R & D" is *all* these colleges are about. But to the extent that they have tackled the problems, the whole of American higher education can profit from their efforts.

Many experimental programs have emerged in the past decade. Each has evolved with specific goals and purposes—sometimes ill-defined—and each seeks to attack varied problems. New techniques of instruction, curriculum and governance have evolved. New ways of managing human, plant, and financial resources have been pursued. However, there has not yet been any rigorous effort to test, evaluate, validate, and communicate the components of these many programs, and their successes (and failures). If the work of experimental colleges is adequately to benefit the whole of education, then their experience—good and bad—must be communicated to the larger educational community. The present volume is a modest beginning.

At the Johnston College Symposium, Frank Newman issued an invitation and a challenge: "We in higher education have been victims of our own sense of elitism in the sense that we have refused to debate openly our problems. We need a national debate on higher education. I ask all of you to join me in this cause."

Although conceived before Newman made this statement, this volume seeks to reflect a candid and extended response to that invitation.

It is clearly time for experimental colleges to work purposefully together in the data-gathering and problem-solving processes which inform their endeavors. It is surprising—and puzzling—to note how little has been done to make a *collective* attack on the present educational problems which are shaping the educational needs of the future.

With better communication among the experimenting institutions, what has seemed like fragmented efforts can be recognized as the real innovations they are, and appraised more systematically. Not every new educational enterprise need make the same mistakes; by distinguishing between educational tinkering and valid innovations, a great deal of wasted educational energy can be rechanneled into more productive efforts.

In this spirit, the Johnston College Symposium raised a large number of questions to which the participants addressed themselves. While these questions were not specifically asked and answered as a fixed agenda, they may be considered paradigm questions which appear in the volume in one form or another.

A. What kinds of experimental programs are in operation?

- What alternatives do they provide, i.e., what new management and governance structures, what new teaching, learning, and evaluation methods have been used?
- Are they independent or part of a larger institution or system?
- Are they public or private?
- What are their goals?
- Were they designed to test a specific theory or administrative approach, or to meet a specific educational or social need?

B. What problems have they encountered?

- What kinds of internal and/or external pressures have had an effect upon them?
- What are the roles of boards, administration, faculty, students?
- Is there consistency within the college in their perceptions of their goals?
- What have been financial or management problems?
- How well have they adhered to their goals?
- How do they maintain continued creativity and avoid atrophy?
- How do they use human, fiscal, and plant resources in new and better ways?

C. What answers have evolved for the benefit of higher education as a whole?

- What experimental programs and projects are capable of duplication at other institutions?
- Which can be adapted at other institutions?
- What information is available about the successes of programs, projects, and processes?
- What are implications of successful experimental programs with respect to admissions, transcripts, accreditation, external degree programs, adjunct faculty, etc.?
- What recommendations emerge with regard to faculty and administrative work loads, the management of time and facilities, the use and management of financial resources, including new ways of budgeting?
- What is the role of the federal government?

It is *not* the intention of this volume to represent itself as a scholarly treatise on higher education, nor to expound any single model of experimental higher education—including its own. Rather, the intentions can be clearly stated as follows.

- — To record for the participants and for the broader educational world the "national debate on higher education" as it emerged at the 1972 Johnston College National Symposium on Experimental Higher Education;
- — To preserve, in doing so, the impact and informality of the actual sessions; to present the symposium in unadorned, straight-forward terms, free of jargon;
- — To provide a source of reference and an experimental base from which educators in all phases of higher education can formulate specific action in their own programs and concerns;
- — To provide a "report from the front lines"—a report from some of those who are struggling with the nitty gritty of recovering the worth of American higher education;
- — To present a "marketplace" overview of some live topics in the *real* world of education—avoiding the extremes of uncritical euphemism and hypercritical anarchy;
- — To provide a core source of reference regarding particular programs, problems, studies, people and resources.
- — And finally: to provide an array of "thinking papers" which will stimulate further debate—both at the '73 Johnston College Symposium and wherever higher education is discussed.

The sessions included in this volume were salvaged from about 12 miles of tape recorded from some 45 different sessions—as many as 12 sessions had been taped simultaneously. Verbatim transcripts were made of about half of the tapes, producing about 1200 pages of rough typescript. Individual transcripts were smoothed (somewhat) and sent to as many co-conveners of the particular session as would volunteer to work on it. After such correction for content, clarity and general coherence, final smoothing was accomplished.

Because the editor had such a large number of taped sessions (45) to choose from, and because many excellent sessions have not been included, a word should be said about the editorial criteria used to inform the choices made. They were as follows:

- Ability to hear and understand the speakers in order to produce a typescript(!);
- Ability to make sense out of the typescript once it was available;
- Coherence and unity of the session, cogency;
- Substantiveness, meatiness, practicality, usability, real-issue grappling;
- Convener and participator enthusiasm as evidenced during the session and in written/verbal evaluations;
- "Now" appropriateness—the session as more than an intellectual, academic exercise; timeliness also in the sense of providing information not readily available in some other form (as with, e.g., UWW, Peace Corps);
- Balance in viewing the eventual audience *both* as those directly involved in experimental higher education and higher education in general.

In a few cases a different style and format seemed appropriate to the convener doing the rewriting. It seemed better to allow this kind of flexibility than to insist on an artificial uniformity.

Editorial enterprises usually depend for their execution on individuals in addition to the one who bears the title. This volume is no exception. I am particularly grateful both to the panelists, and to the following individuals, who helped edit typescripts of their particular sessions for accuracy, clarity and length: Roger Baty, John Chase, Gale Fuller, Tom Greening, Allison Jones, Allen Killpatrick, James Kolka, Clarence Leeds, Cricket Levering, Nelson Swinerton, John Valley, Albert Wight, James Wilson and John Wish.

My Johnston College colleagues—particularly Roger Baty—provided moral support during my "exile" to this editing job, and I am grateful for that. Chancellor Gene Ouellette provided the necessary released time and kept the faith when it mattered. Mrs. Lee Jones kindly let me plagiarize many of her words and ideas for the Preface. Arthur McKenny and Barbara Weber, my editorial assistants, had the fortitude to expose themselves full-time to this difficult task. Other students involved were Laura Wersan and Cathy Chapman, who dared to tackle—for academic credit!—the ghastly job of preparing a rough manuscript from the tapes.

Special thanks are due my wife, not only for her support and patience—though this task upset our summer plans—but for transcribing endless miles of tape, and typing the final draft. Mrs. Angela Sanabia was my indispensable right hand in helping me with endless deadlines, revisions, phone calls, correspondence, Xeroxing, etc. And my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Joseph Axelrod (professor of literature at San Francisco State College and editor for Jossey-Bass Publishers) and Mr. Richard Hansen (Executive Director of the Educational Foundation of America) for giving so freely of their time in making many helpful and substantive suggestions.

Finally, on behalf of the faculty, students and administration of Johnston College and the administration of the University of Redlands, I would like to thank the following agencies and/or institutions for their financial support and interest in this symposium: United States Office of Education; CBS Foundation of New York; The First Western Bank of Los Angeles.

Walter E. Tubbs, Jr.

August 1972

SESSION 1:

TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Panelists: **Josiah Bartlett**
Paul Dressel
Conrad Hilberry
Harold Hodgkinson
Frank Newman

PAUL DRESSEL:

I feel it is necessary, in getting at trends, to consider such things as (1) the democratization of higher education; (2) the increase in percentage of people going to colleges and universities (including people returning for re-education); (3) the increasing number of new programs (external degree programs, etc.); and (4) the introduction of new kinds of bachelor's degrees.

I feel that there is a possible trend represented in our present concern about greater curricular flexibility in education. This reflects, I feel, the necessity to get beyond the definition of processes which are carried on in institutions and the necessity to look at the kinds of *results* that are expected.

If we are talking about granting degrees to people who have not spent any significant amount of time within the walls of institutions, then we have to have some reasonable clarity on what it is that deserves the recognition of this degree.

HAROLD HODGKINSON:

As I see it, the evolvement of changes in higher education is rooted in three major periods or phases: Aristocratic: the education of the socially and economically elite; Meritocratic: the education of the especially talented; Egalitarian: education for all. Understanding these changes helps, in turn, one's understanding of five trends presently emerging in higher education.

(1) The first is a trend toward homogenization of institutions of higher education. A recent study of over 1,230 institutions showed that, in the past three decades, they have become increasingly more like each other. (2) The income difference between college graduates and non-college graduates continues to decline. In the 30-35 age range, in 60 per cent of the cases the income of the college graduate cannot be distinguished from that of the non-graduate. (3) There is a great expansion not only in higher education itself, but in what is called the educational periphery. In 1970 there were 63 million Americans in the corporations (primary, secondary, undergraduate and graduate schools). In 1976, it is estimated there will be 67 million people in the corporation. But in the periphery this includes organizations like IBM, Raytheon, Xerox and so forth. And there are 10,000 preparatory schools in the country (we don't know anything about them). Anti-poverty courses, correspondence courses, TV courses and other kinds of adult education: there were 60 million people in that area in 1970. Thus, by 1976 there will be 82 million Americans taking organized educational work in the periphery. When IBM can grant degrees—as it now can—that changes the name of the game. (4) The fourth trend has been characterized as "The Bluing of America": for the first time there is a large blue-collar class which is sending its children to college. This lower middle class group is moving right into managerial and technical fields. This is in contrast to the vocational indecision of the upper middle class. (At Stanford, for example, 70 per cent of the graduating students are admitted to graduate school, but only 30 per cent actually go. Of all the freshmen at Stanford, 30 per cent of the entering freshmen indicate no career plans whatsoever). (5) There is an irony in the fifth trend. At a time when students are finally being admitted to positions of administrative participation on campus boards and committees—even boards of trustees—power seems to be leaving the campus and moving toward centralized state agencies.

JOSIAH BARTLETT:

I'd like to make two major points with respect to the changing role and nature of the teacher, as this has been altered by the increasing re-connection of education with the world of work.

(1) If teaching is taken to mean developing persons or helping persons develop, then something is needed which might be called a "relocation of the ego" of the teacher. He must relinquish his "parental prerogative"—his right to sit on his ascribed authority—and become a fellow learner. His main satisfaction would come from facilitating the students' growth. Evaluation of this role at Johnston and other experimental institutions suggests a difficulty—viz., that a Ph.D. program does nothing to make the teacher effective in this new role; he still needs "on-the-job training." (2) As more and more students connect with the "real world of work" the teacher, who is already insecure from his new role as facilitator, feels even more threatened; he could even become an enemy of such innovation. Teachers will therefore need help in adjusting to their new roles. The message is clear that the classic disciplines need to be restored in their connection to the world of work.

Those who are running internships and field work programs, will quite likely find themselves part of a whole new trend—the continuing education and nurture of teachers who want to connect themselves once more with the real world.

CONRAD HILBERRY:

I am very concerned with the role of the teacher in the future. It seems to me that it is possible to identify, in the period of the 60's, three fairly clear trends, all of which show a pulling away of the student from the teacher or from the university. (1) The first I would characterize as the impulse to get "back to the world"—to jobs, living with families, planting roots, taking survival courses in the field, going "back to nature." (2) The second trend is the impulse to scrutinize oneself, to try to "discover" oneself, with accompanying intense personal and interpersonal relationships. (3) The third trend is the emergence of the educational technology that Dressel and others have mentioned.

One could conclude from these trends that teachers will indeed become some sort of "switchboard operators." The growing assumption is that the teacher's job will be to put the student where his personal, academic and program needs of the moment can be met.

I have some doubts about this point of view as expressed. For one thing, due to their own inertia, students would not let teachers move them around that way even if they could. Also, there are some really excellent teachers who are expert at connecting up the immediate experience of students with appropriate analysis and interpretation, and with a wide range of information which makes immediate experience meaningful. This kind of functioning would be hard to program and should not be underrated. In fact, "deprived" students just now coming into college are more likely to value this capability on the part of the teachers than the upper class students.

FRANK NEWMAN:

One group that is typically left out of discussions of "the world of higher education" is *society*—the society at large. From this perspective I think two trends emerge as crucial to any discussion. (1) The first is in the form of a question: *Who* is it that society is asking higher education to educate? We can all agree on the "expansion of numbers" in its many forms. But there is a less-noticed change going on also, and this is the alteration in the makeup of the group of people that society is saying "please educate." This is significant because our system of higher education as it is now constituted is not functioning well and is not going to function well until this aspect is taken into account.

Historically we have taken the European attitude—that the university experience is for a narrow group of people who will be *the elite.* Yet that group had, it turned out, carefully nurtured academic skills which were even more finely honed by "the university experience." But now it is clear that most people—more than 50 per cent—are not academically oriented. In fact, they are *un*-academically oriented. This means the system is applying a homogenized model based on *academic* institutions, and this is an inappropriate learning model and style for most people. (2) The second point that emerges, then, is this: as long as we accept the function of the system to be "training this elite," then what we as educators propose as part of the system —asking for funds, positions, etc.—this has been a legitimate activity. What we are in effect saying is: Send your kids to college; give us some money to provide the college and we'll give you back a kid who is going to make a lot of money and succeed in life. But look at the figures! When the population being educated is 70 per cent of the age group, that doesn't leave very many! In a situation in which so many of the age group are going to college we cannot really say "join the elite—it consists of 70 per cent of us!" We therefore follow the traditional American practice of redefining the word "elite."

The difficulty is in the discrepancy between what is presumed to be the case and what *is* the case. It is presumed that jobs requiring university training are becoming so paramount in our society that to be assured of a job one must go to college. In fact, however, the evidence does not support that. We are moving toward the need for a more educated populace, but at a very slow pace and *not* at the fantastic growth rate evident in attendance at college, or in Ph.D. or Master's programs.

The consequence is that the college is now performing a different function than previously. But we in education have not faced that fact, have not adjusted the function of college to the major, massive change that has taken place. It is simply no longer appropriate to exhort people to go to college to get a degree and thus be put in the "elite." On both of these points, I would contend, we now have a system that is sputtering and working poorly at a major portion of our institutions of higher education.

*COMMENT:

What is the evidence that the kinds of students going to college today are not academically inclined?

---

*Comment: Refers here and throughout the discussions to an unidentified participant.

NEWMAN:

Examination of open admissions types of institutions shows that attrition rates are very high. (The rate of leaving college voluntarily goes up in direct proportion to the non-selectivity of the institution.) Studies of high schools reveal that students are terribly bored and dislike their work. Thus the selectivity process at Princeton enables them to achieve a figure of 80 per cent of the incoming students completing the bachelor's degree in four years. At an open admissions type of institution the figure is likely to be 20 per cent. One could surmise that an acceptable reason might be that they have other goals and drop out to go to work. But the students are instead saying very clearly, "I don't like what I'm doing."

Interestingly, the persistence rates of institutions using non-traditional teaching methods run just like those of very academically oriented and selective institutions. The conclusion seems to be that many people who are not academically oriented are considered not successful by our society because they don't like college. The whole question today of whether students are "academic" is a cogent one—though the question itself has been called an academic one.

DRESSEL:

I would like to pick up on the comment about the trend toward a "real world" orientation. Our colleges and universities have shown a marked tendency over a period of years to move into practical areas. There is an increasing concern on the part of students for use of knowledge rather than simply an academic or theoretical experience. Many faculty accept and promote this. They are saying to the students: "Don't waste your time here unless you have some idea how you want to *use* the educational experience that you're having." Yet, all too many faculty members ignore this practical side. Clearly, *one* of the factors that causes an academic orientation is the existence of departments which believe their chore is to enhance the disciplines they represent, rather than suggesting how those disciplines might be used by persons in their work. I am by no means against liberal education but I do believe we need to move to a more *practical* orientation as the basis for all higher education.

COMMENT:

Dr. Hodgkinson made a comment about income differences. What studies are there that support that particular question—i.e., the income of college graduates vs. income of non-graduates?

HODGKINSON:

The Syracuse Policy Research Center puts out a little journal based on statistics from the Department of Labor. Early figures on high school vs. college graduates showed a bi-modal distribution. Through the years the income levels have come closer, have begun to blend; and now, in 60 per cent of the cases the income levels are indistinguishable. (The bias of the study is that professional workers don't really come into their own until they're over 45.)

COMMENT:

In a world in which we speak of new forms of education, in a shrinking world in which we have many cultures and civilizations living together—what *is* our present concept of "a fully educated person"?

NEWMAN:

It is appropriate that we in higher education stand back and ask ourselves the question: What is all this for? What is the *point* of all this?

Historically we have devoted ourselves to talking about the "life of the mind"—intellectual development. But we should increasingly be talking about the question: *Does college help us problem-solve?* We don't like our environment, the use of technology, the way the political system functions—or the design of the average overpass. We want to change all of these things. But neither problem-solving nor any other skill comes, as far as I can see, by sitting in a classroom in a large state university along with 300 other students, listening to someone lecture, and then taking a test. There is no relationship of that exercise to problem solving.

That is one point. Another is the question of one's motivation to participate in society. This is a society in which the motivation to do some of these very arduous and difficult tasks, such as reforming higher education—is unclear. But shouldn't higher education have some sense of helping people arrive at a sense of motivation? My concern is that we take such a narrow view of what it is that is being developed within the colleges that we are missing what seems to me to be the most crucial questions in our society.

HODGKINSON:

The question is also asking something about the relevance of the Johnston College experience—whether this experiment has an important place in American life. There is a cynical comment which can be made about such experiments, but using the Berkeley experimental schools project as an example. The question is this: Are all of the militant, disaffected, bright, and energetic blacks safely drained out of the mainstream, to these little enclaves called experimental schools within the Berkely system, where they can talk to each other and won't damage the ongoing mainstream? It has been suggested that there is some relationship between that finding and experimental higher education as it is appearing elsewhere. That is, looking at it another way: If all the people in experimental education in this room were out raising hell in state universities instead of sitting here, an awful lot would be happening.

NEWMAN:

There is a traditional statement which can and should be made: There is a danger, in reacting negatively to some of the features of higher education, of doing it in an uncritical, unbalanced way. There is something very good in a traditional liberal arts education and such things as traditional as a Ph.D. program.

The objection is not to these. They serve an extraordinary and really first-rate purpose when done well. The objection is that we have made this model universal. Similarly, we have gone the other route and lauded experimental programs as the only good model. It seems to me we would do better not to say that Model A (traditional) in education is wrong and Model B (experimental) is right; rather, we need many kinds of pinnacles of excellence.

But we need to assert that the person who develops a skill in problem-solving in the context of tackling tough social problems is developing, if anything, an even more important skill in our society today than (say) the Ph.D. in English Literature. Because, while we have pushed back the frontiers of knowledge in English Literature considerably, in certain facets of social problem-solving we have a large amount of unfinished business.

COMMENT:

What are likely to be some of the consequences of the new role of the blue collar people as they assume managerial, technocratic roles in decision-making in the economic, financial, and political aspects of society—and what is the relationship of this role to liberal education?

NEWMAN:

This is a very important question and represents another pronounced trend. Historically, a large part of the decision-making in this country was done by what students now are prone to characterize with words like "elite," "establishment," without thought as to what they mean. But there was some sort of establishment historically which was heavily flavored with people who had come from middle class colleges and had gone, usually, to good colleges. They cherished the value of the liberal education and supported the drive in the fifties and sixties in an important way. But that is supported also by a blue collar sort of dream—the American Dream concept in which blue collar people by and large felt strongly that their children should have that opportunity to move into that educational reward too.

This has been altered; this situation has been changed very sharply by the emergence of a class of students, perhaps 10-20 per cent of the student population, largely located at the most affluent institutions. These students are saying that they don't want to be career motivated; they don't see why they have to be career motivated instead of having *no* particular motivation. There is thus a *growing pragmatism* as higher education begins reaching more and more a part of the population. From having been around and talking with legislators and governors and so on around the country, I have the sense that there is a growing reluctance to support this growing trend. This was symbolized to me by the finance director of a state, who said essentially: "Why should we continue—in the light of all the tremendous demands on the state budget, health, welfare and housing—why should we continue to support these 'country clubs'?" And you know—that's a question that deserves an answer.

COMMENT:

What is the relation of experimental or innovative education to the (traditional and still present) demand for performance levels of concept achievement? How do we resolve the need for a nationalized system of measurement—definite achievement goals— over against the individualized criteria of experimental education?

DRESSEL:

I'm a little hesitant to try to define any level of achievement or degree solely in terms of knowledge of content. For one thing the definition, understood to be a minimum in the first place, also becomes the *maximum*. That is, once it is spelled out, that's *all* anybody will want to get in order to earn this certification or get this degree. Secondly: When a particular body of knowledge has to be mastered to get through a degree program, then the direct goal of the student becomes the mastery of this body of knowledge. This may mean learning (particular definitions) in parrot-fashion, with no understanding involved.

I feel that, if we are going to do this then we must do it in terms of developed abilities, competencies, or performance wherein knowledge and its applications are essential. But knowledge would then be viewed in terms of how a person uses it—what he is capable of *doing*.

HODGKINSON:

I think it's a really difficult problem to imagine what the examination is going to be like that is going to do the trick in this context. How do you measure these things? Technological problems such as how to reproduce quickly and cheaply a sheet of paper a thousand times can be solved by the Xerox people. But political problems or problems of the management of higher education have an entirely different character. It's not a matter of a thing that can be solved; it's more a matter of accommodating various needs and forces and allocating resources in a way that seems satisfactory for the moment. No solution can last very long; it won't be solved more than a week; it needs to be solved again and again. How do you test for *that* ability—the ability to solve problems in the context of the real world? (But don't we wish we *could* do that!)

NEWMAN:

It seems to me that non-straight academic testing is a very difficult problem; still, open universities will find this increasingly essential. One of the things we are finding, even with the standard academic establishments, is the growing recognition that in some ways straight academic testing is negatively correlated with performance. An obvious example is medicine. When entry to and passage through medical school is strictly a function of academic testing, the result is a very intellectual, research-oriented student—one who is not terribly interested in the practice of medicine. We need to know what other measures are important and appropriate; we're going to have to devote substantial resources to finding this out.

HODGKINSON:

The ECT did a number of studies a few years ago correlating grade point average in college with success in later life measured along about six different dimensions of success. They found that not only was there no relationship, but in certain respects there was a slight negative relation. So it is possible to say with some authority (and in all fairness) that the existing system does predict pretty well success in the next level; it will tell you who will do well in graduate schools if you're trying to predict an undergraduate program. But it will *not* tell you what that whole system has to do with the world beyond those boundaries.

COMMENT:

This is a question in three parts: First, what is the relationship between innovation (experimental colleges) in higher education and the state systems; is there a trend which could be characterized as infusing this kind of experimental activity into the state systems? Second, is this a good thing? Is this kind of education the right kind of learning strategy to be introducing into a sort of mass-type education? And third: If it is a good thing, do you have any good ideas for strategies for promoting this so that its progress can be accelerated?

HODGKINSON:

One comment can be made via the notion of independent study as being viable only for the academic "elite." It turns out that independent study does not require so much a specific level of ability; it's a process which has to do with your own personal independence, and if you are of a particular frame of mind, you do well in independent study. Now, the stereotype is that state colleges are full of passive, non-autonomous, credential-seeking young people, and, therefore, experimental programs such as independent study might not work. I think this has yet to be tested—and I therefore don't think we can really answer your question about the exportability level. But the techniques that we thought were only for the "experimental" institutions—like independent study, senior projects, etc.—seem to work with a lot of different ability levels, not just the elite.

DRESSEL:

It seems to me that the problem we face is one of institutional inflexibility. One of the greatest problems is to maintain a flexibility in development in the accommodation to new students. The best year of any new experimental college, I am convinced, is the first year. After that the thing begins to get institutional rigor mortis. Perhaps we need a rule that no experimental unit—at least at my kind of university—ought to last more than four or five years.

COMMENT:

I do not feel the question regarding content (what) should be evaded by talking about problem-solving skills (how). Are we going to push off learning content as something personally determined or subjectively dealt with, or referred to the professional schools? Or *are* there concepts and are there data that one should know in particular areas in order to get out of the university with an undergraduate degree?

BARTLETT:

This gentleman has really answered his question for himself. You seem to be saying—for example—that a professional should have both skill and the content-knowledge on which to draw. I don't think any of us would differ with that view. But if you are asking, "Is there *a* content?" then I would want to know who is doing the defining; and I know some people I'd be very hesitant to let define that content.

NEWMAN:

My own sense is that students coming out of college and high school today have a growing amount of content-knowledge. One of the criticisms in recent years is that students are coming to college much further along in the content skills—due to TV etc.—and that the colleges are wasting their time in not recognizing that the first year of content is already there in the students when they enter.

DRESSEL:

This is at the heart of our problem of defining education. Is there a body of content that we should require in order to get through college or to get a degree? I say *no*. I find it impossible to define a body of content. Proficiency in using English; ability to think critically; skills in amassing information—these are in a way much more fundamental and much more important than knowledge per se. I feel we've got to move education in this direction and turn out people who can continue learning. Until we are doing that, we aren't really doing our job.

NEWMAN:

From the kind of pattern of change we have seen emerge in American higher education, it seems clear to me that a massive re-thinking of what we're trying to do as a society is necessary. This puts on us, as members of the academic world, two demands: First, that we be really thoughtful and scholarly and not take things on a rhetorical basis. We've got to go back and find what the motivations of students really are. We need to know far, far more than we know about this in a careful, thoughtful, imaginative but prudent way. The second demand is: To debate openly all of our problems. I think we have been victims of our own elitism and have refused to be open. One of the things we badly need in our society is a return to openness, and a vigorous national debate about higher education.

SESSION 2:

NEW ENTERPRISES IN HIGHER EDUCATION: EVALUATION OF INNOVATION

Panelists: **Harold Hodgkinson**
Frank Newman

FRANK NEWMAN:

Bud (Hodgkinson) and I would like to talk about two things primarily, while staying as flexible as possible. One, the formation of new types of enterprises in higher education and two, how one measures and evaluates the effectiveness of this both in what ought to be done and how effectively what is done, what is tried, actually works.

Among the relevant subjects would be, first: What is the range and scope of innovation we're talking about? Where do we draw the boundary? I think the second question we ought to address ourselves to is: what is the purpose of worrying about innovation and change? We had a very interesting discussion in a remote room here a short time ago about whether we are simply hooked on innovation because, being Americans, we believe that change is a good thing in itself. Or, is there some particular reason or set of reasons—are we so dissatisfied with what's happening in traditional higher education? Thirdly, we surely ought to address the question of how we measure the success of innovation in all this—is it a necessity that innovative forms of higher education be able to compete, in terms of their use of resources, with traditional education? Let's say, if innovation can only occur at a higher cost, is it a failure? What are the measures—is cost going to be one of the measures that we could put in our evaluation? How important is it that higher education and innovative things in higher education deal with other than straight academic values?—what about socialization, achievement, or career preparation and so on?

COMMENT:

Can you simply discuss the term "innovation"?

NEWMAN:

What worries me is that the word innovation, like other words in our society, has reached a point where it's almost meaningless. And I've often heard people say at our university: "It's really been something. You can't believe what's happened; it's been a tremendous year for innovation." And I'll say, "What happened" "Well, during the year we—believe it or not—went to pass-fail grading in some courses." Big deal! To them, that's a tremendous step toward innovation. And I take it that what you mean by your question is how far out are we on the scale before we're innovating or are we just patching up a little bit?

HAROLD HODGKINSON:

I know of one place in the United States that last year went from the grading system to a system of Honors, High-Pass, Pass, Low-Pass and Fail!

NEWMAN:

Well, the reason it's so significant is, I think, because the symbolism of innovation has become important enough now for people to do diddly things and call it innovation just in order to feel a part of it.

COMMENT:

But at least it's new . . .

NEWMAN:

Something bothers me about that. I don't see why innovation has to be new. I don't see what's wrong with it being an old idea as long as it's presently useful.

COMMENT:

What is it that brings about reforms and change—innovation?

NEWMAN:

That, it seems to me, is something we ought to address ourselves to. We spent some time earlier trying to ask ourselves the question: Who causes reform? Who brings about reform? Has it ever been the federal government? I mean, people often argue that the federal government is *the* powerful force for change in higher education. And we tried to measure, whether in fact, it has been. But are there other forces that bring about change? You know Mr. Gardner's famous remark about whether or not faculties would be forced to reform, and his response was—the priesthood never reforms itself. I don't know, it would be interesting to find out. I notice some of the people here who are talking most vehemently about reforming and change are members of the academic priesthood and that may be something worth checking—maybe they would want to come in defense of themselves . . .

COMMENT:

More specifically, I wanted to know if reform is often the work of single individuals?

NEWMAN:

I'd like to make a comment and maybe we could enlarge on it. We tried to examine about 120 institutions that claimed they were different. We were very interested in the question: Is there an entrepreneur who starts them off? And if so, what are the characteristics and the forces that start them off? I think this notion needs a great deal more research. I don't think there is very much known about this. Our conclusions from that effort—which is not nearly good enough—is that in about a third of the cases there is indeed a single individual—and usually from *outside* higher education. Look at the studies that have been done on new enterprises that have been started (for example, there's a fellow from Purdue who has studied new enterprises that have been started around Palo Alto and around Cambridge). What one finds is that almost always they are started by fellows from businesses that are successful but where they sense some sort of frustration—they're blocked in promotion, they're in disagreement with the policies of the company, or the company has been innovative but not innovative enough or something like that. And these people have often started their own operation. There isn't much of that in higher education.

COMMENT:

Isn't one reason higher education doesn't have that model because the customers don't have the money to buy the goods?

HODGKINSON:

There's a slight addition to that. One reason spinoffs happen so frequently in research and development programs and businesses is the dedication of many of the workers to doing things in a different way. So if you have a research company that has a small group of people who really want to do something differently, it's relatively simple for them to do that. As a matter of fact the company usually encourages spinoffs. Stanislaw Company, for example, has spun off eight different publishing companies and everybody gains because they've done that. There's no similar motivation in education that I know of to help people to create these spinoffs. It's almost always done as a wrenching kind of thing, and the parent organization usually objects.

NEWMAN:

I agree with your conclusion but I disagree with the underlying premise. Why shouldn't a faculty member who has been teaching for four years in a monolithic, difficult, arbitrary institution (take Berkeley—it's a good example, O.K?)—why shouldn't he say to himself, "This is ridiculous! I'm dealing in a certain mode of operation and I don't believe in it. I've had a world of experience now, I've done a lot of things, I'm going to start my own operation." Why should someone across town—a lawyer or someone

—end up being the person who starts that one out of a sense of frustration? Why shouldn't the spinoff come from within higher education?

HODGKINSON:

Again I agree. There are, however, some inhibitions in higher education. One is certification and one is funding and both strike me as being terribly important in the new enterprise thing.

NEWMAN:

I frankly think we'll do a tremendous amount. I think the more student-based funding there is, the more likely it is that there will be entrepreneurs from within. In fact, that really is the thrust of whoever suggested the different schools in elementary and secondary education. What they essentially do is go on a tuition basis. There is presently a small number of tuition-based innovations of higher education. There's one here in L.A. Are you familiar with West Coast University? They're an institution that operates only in the evening and they give out associate, bachelor's master's degrees in technical subjects. They have a different format: all part-time faculty, and they live on tuition. And they've been very successful. And interestingly enough, it was not a faculty member that started it. Why should that be? Now, The Pell Bill is essentially about a voucher system. What it does is give scholarships to students and has them carry with them a voucher (a sizeable one, $4200 if I remember) to the institution they want to go to. I would think if one ever started that at the graduate level there would be an enormous change in graduate education. I think there's a chance—a good likelihood—of a voucher system; but I think if it comes, it'll be piecemeal.

I was interested in Bud's earlier comment that the GI Bill was a voucher system. You know what the biggest student aid program in the country by far is at the moment?—the GI Bill. And you know how big it is?—a billion and a half dollars worth. You also know what the second biggest one is because you're all students of it—the Social Security Act—which is also a big system. Social Security has a provision in it that if one parent dies you can get funding up until you're 21, to go to college. And this is now worth about $7½ million. Those two are by far the biggest examples of student aid funding, and they're both on a voucher basis.

HODGKINSON:

Most federal aid programs of this nature are limited to accredited institutions and if ever there was something that holds back innovation, it's the fact that unless you're accredited you don't get any federal aid, which means your whole student body has got to be able to pay. So right from the beginning the accrediting process makes it almost impossible to provide student aid for any sort of innovative program.

NEWMAN:

The real pressure is the flow of federal funding and that's where you really get the bind. We've got something in the works—let me just get your reaction, I think it might be helpful. The proposal addresses the problems in accrediting, particularly as they deal to the issue we're talking about.

One of the difficulties is, that the federal government originally began to use the accrediting process, as I'm sure many of you are aware, more as a convenience than anything else. Somebody asked—about the GI Bill—if you had to be an accredited institution to be accepted. The answer is that the GI Bill program, the Veterans Administration, set up their own accrediting and they used in essence the state system. That turned out to be very cumbersome too; in other words, they left it to the states to accredit for the GI Bill. Almost all other federal programs use the accrediting association and they began to load on the back of the accrediting associations more and more power. I think we discovered 46 different federal decisions that depend on accrediting—ranging from very direct things like the flow of funds, which of course is terribly powerful, to some very indirect things. For example, if you're a student from overseas and you want to come on a campus in this country, you can't come to that campus unless it's on the accredited list, because the

Immigration Services uses that to give out the visas for people coming as students. So inadvertently, when the accrediting associations—which are privately run—got around to accrediting, what it turned out they were doing was controlling the flow of overflow students. No one had anticipated that. So we proposed that there ought to be a dual process. The first process ought to be *eligibility;* that eligibility might very well be determined by the accrediting associations, but on standards set by the federal government. Those standards ought to be consumer protection standards. Then there might very well be a second level where accrediting is accomplished—as it is now—by the institutions themselves, who say whether or not you should get the prestige of being accredited.

This gets back to the point you were making, Frank. Will a graduate school accept you if you've been at Institute of Prescott because they've made a decision about whether they think the program at Prescott is of high enough quality? Well, the idea of the split here is that by having a separate *eligibility* function you're freeing the institutions of the burden of having to meet the accrediting requirements. It seems to me that if you could divide such questions in two you could then have much less of the power and majesty of the federal government coming in on the question of how many books you have in the library, or whether the library ought to be integrated, or whether there ought to be Ph.D's on on the faculty; instead they could devote themselves to consumer protection.

HODGKINSON:

There's a fascinating component to that which I just discovered this year: The accrediting agencies did not begin as accrediting agencies. They began as self-help associations of colleges that wanted to share resources, pool faculty and cooperate with each other. Within about 20 years they began to become so successful that all the other colleges wanted to get in too. And then they had to say oh, we can't take everybody so we'll have to decide who can come in and who can't. And the funny thing about that process is that it was duplicated precisely by the union of colleges and universities—which, when I was first on the board, was a self-help group. It was a bunch of experimental colleges that got together because we thought we could help each other out. Now there are 40 institutions that want to get in and they're going to take two. And the president of the union goes around and makes visits on campuses—seeing if they meet the criteria. It's the same process. There is something about collaborative organizations that begin as loose jointed networks—if they're successful they have to set up rejection criteria. It's almost like physiology, you know, a foreign particle invades the body and you've got to get it out. I don't know why that is, but in organization after organization cooperation has bent to that kind of external force. I don't know why the union, for example, couldn't be open to any college that professes to believe in innovation and the need to move in that direction.

There's no question about the need for minimum standards, but I think it is highly questionable whether or not accrediting agencies are performing their function.

NEWMAN:

As a matter of fact, one of the problems is coming up. I'm convinced that the state legislature will move into the accrediting business all across the country because they're frustrated with the current accrediting. And that, it seems to me, is not going to work well. Stop and think how states do when they get into the accrediting business. They think about things like various kinds of licenses and so on. You know—it usually becomes a very ingroup running a reasonably corrupt and inappropriate type of operation. So I would hate to see higher education get into that bag.

But I'd be interested in any reaction to our idea of a dual standard. We think of consumer protection as being something like the SEC: There's a stock issued and a college has to publish certain kinds of things that tell you certain basic facts about it—a "prospectus." And then if a student chooses to go to a college where it turns out there are no Ph.D's on the faculty, that's his choice; but they have to let you know that there are none.

COMMENT:

If the state goes into the accrediting business, do you see any economic alternatives for a union of experimental colleges other than becoming a large-scale organization?

HODGKINSON:

Before we deal with that question, let me propose the other option, viz., federal accrediting control. There are a lot of people talking about control of accrediting agencies by the federal government. FRACHE, The Federation of Regional Accrediting Agencies in Higher Education, is setting up a strong central office in Washington and regional differences in accrediting procedures will be eliminated. This is their plan for the next few years. So it suggests another option to your question. You will notice, by the way, that the union believes the best way to get together is by getting the presidents of the institutions together. I've become convinced that that's the *worst* way to get people together. The best way is to get some kind of network that would allow the approximately 2,000 institutions in this country who have a commitment to some kind of innovative approaches to education to get together. I don't know what the network would look like; it might be like the People's Yellow Pages which you've probably all seen. It seems to me that kind of format would be the way to get at the kinds of things we're taking about.

It seems to me that a terribly important thing on this whole question of innovation and new institutions is to try to identify accurately the real inhibitions to those institutions. Accrediting is clearly one. We made enough of a study to say, I think without a shadow of a doubt, that the specialized ones—not particularly the regional ones—really lean on new types of institutions and freeze them out. Now whether they do that accidentally or intentionally is another matter; I would presume it's largely accidental. A good example—the traditional value I've often used to try to describe this is the night law school. We've gradually frozen out most night law schools in this country, with rules like "you must have as many full-time faculty members as part-time faculty." There are all sorts of things like that. A question you have to ask when you freeze out those institutions is: Are the lawyers that come from night law schools better or worse than day school lawyers? I know of no study that shows anything of this sort. For all we know they're much better or much worse. We do know one thing, though—that the night law schools have performed a terribly important function in this country: the social mobility up and out for people who really want to make it, or who are highly motivated, who go through a bachelor's degree then go grinding away somewhere to get a night law school degree and finally become a lawyer. Particularly those who go into politics. And that's a terribly important function. That's what we're trying to do—to enhance social mobility. And here's a great institution for it and we're freezing it out on the accrediting list.

What are some other inhibitions? Funding is one. We should ask some questions about funding and what we can do about it to bring about flexibility, etc. I think there's a third thing—both an inhibition and an aid—and that is the advent and rise of large multi-campus systems. It seems to me the crucial thing in terms of the entrepreneurs we're talking about, is to make their lives easier and more effective; to encourage more people to get into it. And these inhibitions undoubtedly get in the way.

HODGKINSON:

One answer to that question is to look at the ways we can increase the reward structure for innovators; another possibility is to lower the threat level. It's amazing how few administrators have ever looked at the possibility of reducing the threats to innovation. They always try to dangle a carrot out there because I guess that's the only method of motivation they know. But this notion of trying to find out what threatens people about innovation, and then eliminating those areas—it's astonishingly successful.

Let me give you a mundane example. I worked with an elementary teacher training program for a couple of summers. The women, I regret to say, were very bad at science and they had all kinds of trouble with these mundane, little trivial kinds of experiments. We couldn't figure out why they were having all this trouble. And here's the reason. Most of the women who were there had a definite fear of the two little pen light batteries they had to put into the boxes to make it go—that if they touched the two ends of the two batteries at the same time, they'd be electrocuted! I hate to bring up this example but it's very appropriate; because once we found out about that we were able to eliminate that threat, from then on their performance went zooming up in the science area. If we just tried to keep on rewarding them—"Here's five dollars; put the batteries in the box,"—they wouldn't do it.

COMMENT:

I like the first part—consumer protection; I think that everyone deserves some protection in that regard. But from there on out it seems to me that the graduate schools, trade schools, social agencies, etc., need something like a fair housing law. That is, anyone then who meets the qualifications to do the job could get equal consideration, regardless of where their degree comes from or whether they have a degree or not. So I go along with this consumer protection sort of thing. I wouldn't go along with letting some elite group decide what degrees are acceptable for admission to school or specification for a job.

COMMENT:

What I'm getting at is: Does anybody else feel it is feasible to have a national law set up for experimental education—maybe to get some federal funding to the non-accredited institutions? Could we ever agree on any one thing like that?

HODGKINSON:

It was about six years ago the students of Berkeley raised the question: "Isn't there some way we can have an influence on policy?' They had been assuming that Roger Heyns was the seat of all knowledge and if they could just get Heyns on their side they would be all set. Heyns had in his office, they thought, a Black Studies button, you know: "If only that bastard would press that button"—out would come ten Ph.D's and $500,000. The trouble with Heyns, they thought, was, that he wouldn't press that button. Well, now they're wiser. They know that Roger Heyns never had that button; he had almost no initiating power. He had no budget of his own he could move around; he had no money in the bottom drawer of his desk (which is where all administrators are supposed to have it). Now the students know where the power is: It's in the departments and it's in Sacramento. And now they're in all departmental committees and we have a state lobby in Sacramento that reversed the decision of the governor to veto 1 million dollars in student aid funding this year, and the reversal was accomplished almost entirely by the activities of that student lobby. They now have *two* student lobbies in Washington doing the same sort of thing. So the strategies are now being worked out. But I don't think they're being worked out in the large majority of the experimental schools.

COMMENT:

I think many of you may have noted that there have been a series of meetings over this weekend talking about the possibility of developing a National Resource Center for Experimental Higher Education. I think that possibility is going to be presented at the final session tomorrow. It would involve the kinds of things we're talking about—networks of faculty etc.; there's a tentative plan for formation of that kind of network.

HODGKINSON:

There have been a lot of these kinds of plans and I only hope somebody will take the initiative and make a go of it.

NEWMAN:

I want to make a suggestion along that line; something I mentioned before. If you ask yourself, "What is it we're going to lobby for and to whom?"—that gets us back to the question of how does it work,-—what are the points of leverage? It seems to me that the most potent fact—the most important leverage from all of our points of view—is the *public recognition* that there is, in fact, a problem that ought to be addressed.

I went to a conference that the OEC ran in Paris recently. I talked about what my second task force is doing, and the response was remarkable. Now, in the European system there's a ministry of education and when somebody sets out to reform it, it works like this: The education minister goes and gets a plan together and takes it to the Parliament; they pass it or they don't (in which case he's out of a job); if they pass it, it becomes a law and everybody changes. And they were assuming that since I was describing this, that I was going to hand it to Richardson and he was going to say, "Thanks," and run down to the Parliament here and we were going to pass this thing and change everything! And, tomorrow morning across the whole United States 25,000 institutions would immediately function differently! It didn't dawn on me that we've got a very different system.

I think that even if Mr. Richardson approves (he's very enthusiastic about it so far) and even if Congress approves, it wouldn't make a bit of difference. It just wouldn't happen. So, how do you do it in this country? You have seriously to think about that issue because it doesn't hapen that way. We cannot do it by fear; it must at least begin by identifying the issues clearly.

For example, if indeed students are left out of this whole process because there's not a teaching style or format that's appropriate to them—then unless we make that an issue in the United States, nobody is going to address it. And I think we as academicians have underrated the importance of some measure of prudent, thoughtful, scholarly Ralph Naderism. I think we're all derelict. And I, offhand, do not know of a more important thing to do than to say forcefully and effectively and with documentation: There is indeed a problem that we are addressing.

HODGKINSON:

I've been amazed in my own work this year, in working with regents and legislators to find that they're enormously open to questions like this. The U.C. Regents, for example. I presented a study of two innovative places—Santa Cruz and San Diego—and their questions were terribly sharp and terribly precise and they got very interested in this whole question of evaluation. "How do we *know* that this San Diego School is doing a good job or not?" etc. So it seems to me there are potential allies among the over-30 group and a lot depends on how we approach them. And again, it's this matter of lowering the threat level. If the trustees think, you know, "this is all gobbledygook, I don't understand it," they're going to react negatively, with great hostility. But if you try to bring them in so they can see that the problems are pretty simple minded and so are the strategies that we're using to solve them, then they can kind of get with it. It seems to me that in state governing boards, you have another group that would be very open to some genuine conversion tactics.

NEWMAN:

There are certain notions that the legislature normally use: what do they say, every American ought to have the opportunity of higher education? But you can't deal with higher education in a way you can with a sausage factory. It's very different. Research is essential to our modern life. And if we were legislators, we would end up fairly frustrated too. I guess I'm saying: We need to go beyond our usual safe stance and recognize our problems. To hide our problems is to inhibit the flow of funding.

HODGKINSON:

The students are doing that! We don't yet have very good evidence that we can present to the legislators because of the way we record data on student success. If we had some evidence in the category I would call valued agenda, then you say that, compared to the student who comes into the institution, you have added so much to that person's knowledge, stature, personal growth—whatever you're interested in doing. Most of our measures are steady-state measures that we take at the end: You take a course, at the end of it you get an exam; it's too late to do anything about it. The time to take an exam is in the *middle* of the course when we still have some time to make mid-course corrective maneuvers and shift things around. If we had that kind of measurement, we could then go to the legislators and say, "Look this is the kind of student we get in; these are the ways in which we move them. We move them about that far." That's the kind of thing a legislator can understand.

NEWMAN:

This is important. One of the things that innovation in higher education has come to mean, in the public eye, is often elimination of standards of structure. That, I think, poses a great danger. It is true that, for some students what they really need is to get away from the frustration of the artificial boundaries that surround them. But for most parents, for most students, that's not true. Most parents know this because if they free their own kids from all the constraints of family life, they do nothing. They know from experience that somehow structure is necessary for the orderly process of the child. One of the things we ought to be very, very careful about is to say that innovations should have *higher* standards in terms of rigor, evaluation, performance. I don't mean the same standards—I don't mean that if we set up an experimental college we're to restrict it to only students with higher than 700 SAT scores. I don't mean that. I think it would be more valid to restrict some to *lower* than 500 SAT scores. What we ought to say, however, is that if you come through this program, by God, it's an *effective* program—we can demonstrate it's a tough program and when we say it's "innovative" education we mean if anything, better education. I think we're suffering from the fact that right now "innovation" really means something very fuzzy like Old Westbury—that you go out there and everybody wanders around and sits on the grass.

COMMENT:

How do you get legislators to understand what you're saying?

HODGKINSON:

One thing that they're very interested in is a little study of institutional functioning done by Educational Testing Services a couple of years ago, called the *Institutional Functioning Inventory.*

It has about twelve scales, three of which have to do with democratic governance and the concern on that campus for democratic governance; a concern for undergraduate education and the institution as free; and morale, the feeling of well-being, or loyalty to the institution. There are some little graphs that compare Antioch and West Point in those two dimensions. Antioch has about the highest democratic governance scores of any institution we tested; they have one of the highest undergraduate education concerns scores. And West Point, as you would expect, is not too high on democratic governance. They also are not terribly interested in undergraduate education. But if you look at what happens on institutional morale—Antioch has the lowest morale score of any institution we tested and West Point has one of the highest. Which is helpful—to know that the kind of people who go to Antioch don't trust the institutions. They didn't want to be Eagle Scouts; the girls didn't go out for cheerleading in high school, and so on. In fact, one of the things that holds Antioch together is the common conviction that it's a crummy place!

Military college on the other hand is full of people who love to salute and be saluted and they have STL scores you woudn't believe! In the mornings they get up when the bells ring . . . . Now you just imagine putting the Antioch student body and faculty on the West Point campus for one day: You'd have the biggest conflagration since the Civil War! If you took the military college people and put them at Antioch, nobody would get up because no bells ring at Antioch.

That kind of exposition is duck soup for legislators. They know what that's all about because they have to make those same kinds of decisions in their own work and they can understand something about differences in college environments. This talk takes about a minute and a half. So that's the kind of thing they can then say, "Well—so I wouldn't like to go to a place like that;" and most legislators, I find, work very much the way I do—I make comparisons with my own famiy and if it fits, fine and if it doesn't—all right. They've got kids and they care about their kids and they're pretty bright people. Understand that and you can communicate.

COMMENT:

But how easy would it be for you to convince them that undergraduate liberal education is *more important* than what they might get at West Point? Would you attempt it?

HODGKINSON:

We have another set of scales on the University of California at Berkeley. Berkeley has the lowest UE score of any institution in the original sample. They have the highest AK score, which is a concern for the advancement of knowledge. Now if you go through all the institutions of the samples, as you gradually increase the concern for the advance of knowledge, you gradually decrease the concern for undergraduate education. And they can understand that.

NEWMAN:

I'm not sure you can have both.

HODGKINSON:

Not in the same institution. Not at the same place at the same time.

NEWMAN:

That's it. That's exactly the point. One of the things that troubles me about this is that a lot of the discussion today has related to factors that don't quite take into account, it seems to me, what you're taking about here—namely, that this is very much a question of socialization. The socialization of students: What are we trying to socialize them for? What I draw out of Bud's comment about homogenization—which is certainly a view that I share—is that we homogenize the institution and serve a diverse population with a homogeneous set of factors. This is why we should worry about innovation and diversity. It seems to me terribly important that we recognize we are talking about a diverse population, all of which is now going to college, and is therefore getting more and more diverse. There is a spectrum of students that runs from very selective academic students all the way to very unselective students. And you can take others to fit this quality of very salute-oriented all the way over to very unsalute-oriented. You can go on to several other spectrums and if you have enough of these and you get enough students, the thing you have to watch out for is that students begin to appear in large numbers to have characteristics of human beings! They get very diverse one from another. In other words, if you get enough students, you can almost say that they aren't human: In that set of circumstances, it's very likely that no one set of characteristics is going to do that job. And it seems to me that we ought to be making arguments that to meet this diverse set of needs we can't have a college on every corner; we must instead have diverse institutions to match these diverse needs. That seems to me to be absolutely crucial!

HODGKINSON:

One of the reasons the homogenization argument is important is that there are several measures in the federal system right now which would provide institutional support on the basis of credit hours generated. In other words, the more student credit hours you generate the more federal money you get. What that's going to do is homogenize all these institutions a lot more. It will develop what I call a "seats-warm" index. In other words, every seat in every building has got to be warm; as soon as one guy slides out another guy has got to slide in. Now those things are not science fiction; a provision for aid to institutions on the basis of credit hours generated may well become a reality.

COMMENT:

I don't see why, if innovation is clearly more effective, we *can't* challenge the traditional system to demonstrate that what it's doing now is as effective as the innovative.

NEWMAN:

I disagree with that. It seems to me that in a society like ours in which there are a lot of opportunities for change, the burden of proof should be on the innovator and the reformer. It's terribly easy to make a mess of things and no matter what institutions are like now, they sort of half-function; and before you go from half-functioning to no-functioning, it's worth having a lot of prudent thought. I really think the burden ought to be on us to argue for change; I think that's where the burden of proof really rests. I don't see why we should be excused from that any more than the guy who stands up in the Congress of the United States and says the seniority system should be changed. I think the burden of proof is on him too.

There are some institutions though, that are moving as you suggest. And I know one vice-president for academic affairs, who, when somebody comes in with a new idea, instead of asking that person to defend that idea, he immediately calls for justification of present practice. And it's remarkable how few of the present practices can be justified.

COMMENT:

Isn't one way of resolving old-guard new-guard hassles to get an all-new faculty which would not have the usual inhibitions?

HODGKINSON:

This is what I call the enclave strategy. You know, you isolate a bunch of experimental faculty and put them over there and give them benign neglect and they'll be all right. I'm concerned about the fact that very few university enclaves have had a major impact on the parent institution. Hefferlin's study indicates that parallel track innovations don't generally have much effect. There are some notable exceptions: I was very pleased to talk with Dave Riesman from Harvard who indicates that some new colleges are finally beginning to permeate the shell—it's a pretty thick shell. By and large it's a difficult path to follow.

NEWMAN:

I'd like to ask this question, Bud. Some of you here are faculty at innovative institutions. Do you feel threatened or non-threatened by that? I think that's an interesting question. My point is that one of the inhibitions is that faculty members entering an institution, because of the innovation process and the innovative efforts, find themselves essentially threatened (in a career sense, I presume). Since many of you are faculty in this situation, would you say it is a threatening situation compared to your normal lot of life or not? Does any one have a sense of that?

COMMENT:

I feel, because I'm in an innovative program I'm in a much *stronger* position at the university than I would be otherwise.

HODGKINSON:

Does it bother you that when you go to the learned society conferences, you're kind of looked down on as "one of those who teaches in that funny place"?

COMMENT:

No, that doesn't bother me. My peers are people who share interests with me—and frequently those are students. And it happens that in the 1970's, where I am, that gives me a stronger position than if I were well respected in that learned society.

NEWMAN:

I've had a sense of that too. I've been surprised at how many faculty members have voluntarily got in touch with us and told us that they're interested in innovation, much more than we expected there to be. I have another suggestion as to one thing that could be done. The reward system in this country for faculty is very clear, and the federal government party to it. The reward system is: promotion, and other major things such as travel to conferences, travel abroad, service on a presidential advisory committee, etc., a chance to get direct funding (which frees you from some of the constraints of the Chancellor because you got a big contract and he doesn't want to push you around because it's yours); things like that. Those things often flow from federal funding which is closely associated with scholarly excellence. Right? I think that's fairly clear.

If the federal government begins to reward, in a similar fashion, people who are innovative teachers and entrepreneurs, I wonder if the same thing will happen? For example, most of you who have come here find funding hard. The notices of this meeting were replete with statements like you're going to have to pay for your own lunch. When the physicists got together in the 1960's that subject never came up. You know, notices never said bring $1.50 because you'll have to pay for your own lunch. If one turns around and makes the reward system work, for innovative teachers and entrepreneurs and their educational efforts, I wonder if it won't have a very significant effect in reversing the kind of thing we're talking about, as it now exists.

HODGKINSON:

That leads me to one of my pet ideas, which is that we need a new kind of laboratory school. In most of the major schools of education we have, as you know, laboratory high schools in which practice teachers are able to try out new techniques, research can be done, etc. These are federally supported. I'd like very much to see a series of laboratory colleges in the United States, where new ideas could be tried out in a relatively free and open environment and the results could be spread around the country. At the present time we have no such plan. That kind of thing might induce a faculty reward structure that would make faculty see those positions as very prestigious.

COMMENT:

Why aren't there more schools of education involved in this?

NEWMAN:

One of the fascinating things is that in the debate of higher education, which is now a roaring debate, the schools of education are very badly under-represented. We've got another proposal on graduate education and it has a statement in there which we sent to a whole bunch of people in the graduate field and to the deans of schools. It talks about some of the problems of graduate education, not the least of which is that the schools in some of the most pressing social areas are the least affected schools. When we go to a major national debate—like the debate over the family assistance plan—the whole reform of welfare gets discussed. But no one thinks of going and having an intense debate with the faculties and deans and so on of the schools of social work. Think about that. The schools of education are playing a very small role in higher education. In fact, one of the very disturbing things to us when we put the first task force together was the one common piece of advice we got all over the country: Don't put anyone on the task force from the school of education. That's terribly troubling. I think that's a serious problem, and why is that true? Don't misunderstand, don't get me wrong. Personally I think there are very, very sharp people in schools of education. But I think as a whole, the schools don't perform anything like the role that, say, the schools of medicine perform in medical affairs, the schools of business perform in business affairs, the schools of law—you know the schools of law make a fantastic contribution to the legal system in this country. I don't know. Maybe it has something to do with the fact that they are academically low on the prestige ladder and draw relatively less prestigious and bright students.

HODGKINSON:

I think there is a further point, which is that the people who go to schools of education are people who went to public schools and liked it. Why else would they go?

NEWMAN:

Why don't they go as reformers?

HODGKINSON:

And then, the people who went to schools of education like that, are the people who return as faculty; and you have a system that feeds on itself.

As a consequence of this compartmentalization the faculties of the liberal arts graduate program have had the feeling they *really are* better. And because the distances are so great you begin setting up those stereotypes and you can maintain them because you never see anybody in the school of education. At Columbia they say that 125th Street is the widest and longest street in the world because it separates Columbia from the School of Education. Nobody ever goes across the street. Given that kind of stereotype, it has been possible through the years for the academics and the arts and sciences to maintain the classic position that Jacques Barzun took ten years ago—when asked to describe the school of education, he said it was imitation pearls cast before real swine.

Barzun could only make that statement because he knew nothing about the school of education where he was. But because of that separation, there has been a superiority complex in the minds of the arts and science faculties and they perpetuate the myth. But we're now in a time—partly because grant support is drying up—when the arts and sciences have got to be more concerned about teaching. This is happening at Berkeley. For example, in natural sciences, the teachers are getting very concerned to see nobody taking physics. Here you have this department that's the glory of the world in certain aspects of physics, and they don't have any students.

NEWMAN:

A similar set of schools, twenty years ago, were the business schools. Business schools—the Harvard Business School was even off across the river. All business schools were treated the same. They were not really academic—you know, sure you could go to business school but that wasn't really going to graduate school. And the faculties were considered second rate. But ever since that period the business schools have been on an ascending position of prestige in the academic world. Today, many of the very best economists and sociologists in the country are in business—business schools are playing a larger and larger role in business affairs. The question is: Why hasn't that occurred in schools of education, schools of social work, schools of public health? Or some of the other absolutely crucial areas—schools of public administration?

COMMENT:

Why has it occurred in the business schools?

NEWMAN:

Well, I don't know. One of the things, argued one of our task force members, is that: "It might very well be that the crucial difference is that schools that are in trouble are schools that are training people for relatively bureaucratic low paying occupations; and the ones like law, medicine, and business which have done very well are ones that train people for higher paying occupations." And, incidentally, these are careers in which one has more personal freedom and flexibility to do things. One can be a lawyer and be an innovative and driving person—you can run around and change the universe, and be on your own, and do lots of things. It's very hard to think of being an assistant principal and being free in that same sense. I don't know whether that's the explanation. I would surely welcome your ideas—I think this is the sort of thing someone should do a serious study on.

HODGKINSON:

There are a number of personality studies that do indicate that people who do attend law, medicine and schools of that sort are entrepreneurial in the way they're put together. They're hustlers, they believe in themselves, they have a lot of autonomy, they want to change the world and they think they can do it. People who are attracted to service oriented careers including social work, mortuary science (because they want to work with people too), the education profession, do not attract the same personality correlate—the entrepreneurial type. And I think that's at least some support for your thesis.

NEWMAN:

Absolutely. Are we worried more about a driving, dynamic school of public health or a driving, dynamic school of medicine? With our present circumstances, we'd all vote for public health.

The same with social work—that's an area in which we've got just huge problems and very little talented, driving manpower.

There is a growing awareness at present of the importance of early learning; the question is whether more investment should not be made there—rather than, say, in the college. I don't think you can deal with the problem in that way. I think we're dealing on a very large scale with *both* problems. We are spending 30 billion dollars on higher education in addition to what we called the periphery earlier. So that's a huge amount of money. And we're also spending an even larger amount of money for elementary, secondary and pre-school education. The appropriate question is more: Can we do something with that 30 billion dollars that's *more effective?* And it seems to me that the answer has got to be, *yes*.

I don't think we should anticipate that even if we could solve the various problems down the line we've been talking about that we wouldn't have to worry about higher education. Far from it! I think it's absolutely mandatory that the American system of higher education turn its attention in the 1970's from straightforward expansion to examining the kinds of issues—such as the measurement and effectiveness issue—we have been discussing.

SESSION 3:

EVALUATION OF EXPERIMENTAL HIGHER EDUCATION

Panelists: **Donald Brown**
Paul Dressel
Harold Hodgkinson
Robert Pace

DON BROWN:

The whole question of evaluation is, of course, a very difficult one. What do we mean by "evaluation"? Why do we do it? But even before that we have to address ourselves to the question: What do we mean by "experimenting institutions"? There seems to be present today considerable confusion between "experimental education" and "innovative educational program" or just a "different" educational program. Experiments, to some of us, mean something fairly specific in the way of systematic variations, controlled observations and data collection and analysis.

As for the *purposes* of evaluation, I think I could list a few quite quickly but not necessarily in order of importance. Obviously one purpose would be to help in the decision process as to whether or not a particular "experiment" or innovation should be continued. Should it be funded in the future? Should people continue to devote their time and energy and university resources to it? That's probably the most immediate and practical purpose of evaluational studies.

Another purpose of evaluational studies, or at least a very useful spin-off effect, is that they do provide useful feedback which allows you to alter programs, to see how you're doing before you've done it too long and can't change. Another very useful spin-off is that when evaluation is done correctly, you are forced to specify what your outcomes and your goals are. This is a very difficult problem, particularly in regard to something as poorly defined as a liberal education. People accept the "good outcomes of liberal education" very much on faith. They're not easy to define. In some studies done some years ago we found that most liberal educators are quite capable of telling you which students obviously profited from exposure to their four-year program. They can do this much better than they can tell you what it is they tried to accomplish with these students. With such a list of nominees, you can work backwards and see what happened to those students during that period; what criteria they now seem to meet or how they differ from students that faculty (one set of expert judges) don't nominate, don't like, don't see as successful products. Then, of course, a fourth aspect of evaluation is the one that characterizes the recent work I have been doing. I think Paul Dressel will take exception to whether it's in fact evaluation—i.e., for a useful purpose other than our own. This is the notion that all evaluation—of course—has a fundamental research aspect to it. For example: If you evaluate an education program—whether you focus on students, academic achievements, or on any other outcome—in order for an evaluation to be properly made you have to learn a good deal about the process of how one arrives at these goals, regardless of what the goals might be; in part taking into consideration value judgments as to which goals you choose as desirable. At any rate, the process by which one reaches these goals, and the approach in reaching them, is a basic research problem in personality theory or what I would like to refer to as the Social Psychology of Higher Education—the interaction of students with living and educational environments. After all, we are talking about a period of human development when we speak of the college years.

PAUL DRESSEL:

There is a very cynical—but maybe justified—point of view about American higher education. It is one that I think has led the experimental or experimenting (or innovative, because one of them is really experimental in the scientific sense of the term) programs to note that the traditional programs are unsatisfactory yet have no adequate evaluation. Many of these innovative programs involve primarily a new pattern of experiences selected on the basis of pleasure and satisfaction. This leads to looking at the *experiences* provided or to the environment rather than at the results of the experience.

COMMENT:

Should one base an evaluation on experience or results? With the external degree, for example, how do you evaluate non-traditional experiences?

DRESSEL:

Now, I hold the point of view regarding evaluation that the *results* of the education are the essential concerns. We may be forced to look at results or else we're going to have an awful lot of degrees awarded to people for doing very little. Many institutions in this country are now talking about external degrees where people don't have to be on a campus, where they do various amounts of work and will be granted a degree. We can't then talk about experience or environments in the sense that we customarily do on our college campuses. We'll need to talk about this in terms of what level of performance, what kind of achievements, what competencies, deserve recognition by a bachelor's degree. And this is my concern. *I really don't care about the qualities of the experience provided in any experimental college* except as they recognize that people learn in many different ways. What I'm interested in is a definition of a level of achievement that we think deserves the award of a Baccalaureate degree.

HAROLD HODGKINSON:

I think that evaluation has been based on fallacious assumptions. Most people who do it are psychologists. They have great faith in nationally standardized norms, they have great faith in analyses of variance and such techniques. I happen to be a sociologist, and I'm concerned with how people interact and cultural dimensions and rites of passage. I happen to have gone through that dehumanizing process at Berkeley—submitting my life, my ego, my sacred soul to a bunch of people to determine whether I was honorable enough to be promoted. I never found out their names, I never talked to them to find out what I could have done better; they disappeared into the night and they left me with this little slip of paper that said that I had made it. This was, in many respects, the most harrowing experience of my life. I think *evaluation has only one central function.* And that is, to improve the performance of either institutions, programs or individuals. The function of rejecting programs, individuals or institutions—I don't think needs to be done. I think almost any institution that can support itself by appealing to enough students willing to come to it, ought to be continued—at least for those people. It seems highly inappropriate to reject the institution because it doesn't meet the accrediting standards which I think have been highly questioned in the last couple of years and will certainly be questioned more. I hope Frank Newman will talk later on about some of the questions that are being raised about the accrediting process. I think it's time we began moving in some new directions and perhaps set up a real cadre of people in the United States who are concerned about innovative education. At the moment we have no political force with anybody in Washington who represents people like yourself—people like me. Certainly, the Council on American Education does, and I can tell you that. So maybe it's time we began thinking in terms of evaluating at a level larger than an institution so that we can go to certain people who dispense money, power and prestige and tell them what it is that we would like developed.

Accountability has come to mean, in the minds of many experimentalists, retribution. In other words, "if people really find out what we're doing, there's going to be hell to pay." The other side of that, of course, is that if people find out what we're doing, and we're doing it wrong, it could be a reward system too. But we always think of an evaluation as though it were retribution and our neck is going to be on the line. Maybe it's time we began thinking in a more positive way. I have a strong feeling, for example, that questionnaire research is coming to a rather sharp end.

I'm very concerned about participant observation, about various kinds of interviewing styles, and about such things as unobstrusive measures, in which, without asking anybody anything, you simply watch the universe go by and see what kind of generalizations you can make about it. I find that a lot of descriptive analyses of that sort fit into the category of evaluation. They may have nothing to do with other institutions; they may not fit into any standard, but they may be terribly useful in describing how you or your institution is working. And I would hope that in the next few years we can get more people interested in evaluation where it will be looked at in a broader context.

BOB PACE:

Well, I like what I just heard. I think evaluation is concerned with information and with judgments and with conscience. It has purposes, among which are to stimulate conversation and debate among faculty members, administrators and students as to what is happening and how people feel about it. I think that as far as information goes, there are two kinds of considerations that are essential: *relevant* and *adequate* information. If you only look at one piece of a phenomenon, like what goes on in a classroom, you have by definition not dealt with adequate information. It may be relevant to the one part you're dealing with, but it is not adequate. Since institutions and human beings are all complex phenomena it has been basically a mistake to try to look at things one at a time or in fragments, because nothing exists that way in the world. In the very process of isolating it you often have lost what the phenomenon was.

I have a particular interest in looking at whatever the broader complexities might be in the situation I'm dealing with. Suppose you take any kind of an experimental program or non-experimental program or some other aspect of an institution—with what sort of information might you be interested? Well, you need to understand what its place is in the particular setting in which it operates—that is, who is served and what is its attraction and what sort of opportunities are available? Are these same kinds of opportunities available anywhere or is there something unique or special about them? What sort of activities do students or faculty members engage in that differ from their customary engagements in some other part of the institution? And I would agree with Paul (Dressel) that you need to understand something about its products—although I would prefer to use the phrase "understanding something about its consequences." Who and what might have been influenced? What ideas have been picked up by other people and have a bearing on what happens in other parts of the institution or external to the institution or even in one's own personal development? I think for the most part the typical attitude toward evaluation has been to look at end products and test scores. In most admissions studies, for example, the criteria most often used to predict whether someone is going to succeed or not is the grade point average. It never struck me that the grade point average was an adequate way to symbolize what has happened to a student during his first year in college. I'm sure something has happened to him besides his grade point average. I really do think that it's terribly important to look at the whole context. Unless you do, you never really understand it. Evaluation concerns having some set of relevant and adequate information that will contribute to reasonably wise judgments and to keeping your conscience alive about the whole process.

COMMENT:

It seems to me that a major philosophical issue has been raised in the comments the four of you have made. It's a disagreement over the role that output measurements can play, over against some attempt to see environment, climate or the other metaphor (influence) that you used. I wonder if you could try to focus on that more particularly?

DRESSEL:

Well, I can comment on my concern and point of view in terms of some years ago. I was in the unusual position of being told that I could set up any procedure I wanted, to evaluate the level of education of returning servicemen and other adults and make recommendations which would have to be accepted by various colleges and departments. These people would then complete whatever was left over in the way of requirements to get a degree. But the one thing I wasn't able to get rid of consonant with what I said earlier was the one-year residence requirement. The President and the Board wouldn't give up on that one. They said, "They have to be here at least a year and we have to have a mark on them somewhere—a brand." But we did have a number of people to whom we gave as much as three full years of college credit. Now, in these exceptional cases we didn't ask anything about the environment in which this learning was taking place or the kind of learning experiences. We were talking about the assessment of the level of achievement and competence of the person. And I think we're back to the necessity of looking at that, with this advent of the external degrees and a lot of programs for recognizing achievement altogether apart from whether one is on that campus or not.

So I'm saying in a way that if one knows something about environment and process and can evaluate this in terms of the effectiveness with different kinds of students in different fields—this is useful. But in a sense, the payoff, ultimately, is what the person can *do* (for example) in the area of communication. What can he do in defining a problem and working on it himself? I don't care what his transcript shows or what his records are. If I want to know what he can do with mathematics, I can give him a book and three or four hours to read it, and have him come back and tell me about it. I can determine his level fairly quickly on this. I can do the same thing in most other areas. This is the method I would use and I think we either go in that direction or we end up by reducing the whole nature of our whole degree concept in this country.

HODGKINSON:

I think there are mergers that are possible between the kind of thing that's been done in the sort of environment that I'm interested in. But first I'd be interested in asking Paul (Dressel)—Why did you insist on the year's residence?

DRESSEL:

I didn't; the President and the Board did.

HODGKINSON:

But you went along.

DRESSEL:

I couldn't do anything about it.

HODGKINSON:

Is there any proof that a year's residence produces any particular kind of educational growth?

DRESSEL:

Of course not, and I do not defend the residential requirement. My point is that, to move from insisting on four years on campus to recognizing the equivalent of three and requiring only one is progress in the right direction.

HODGKINSON:

I think that a lot of difficulty here is in part a matter of definition. We have inherited a degree structure from a historical tradition and placed it into a very dynamic society, traditionally pluralistic, therefore creating institutions to serve every market that can afford to pay whatever fees are set. Therefore, the notion of one degree comes to mean multiple sins. This is what contributes a lot to the confusion of defining evaluation. If, by evaluation, you mean: What are the outcomes on standard academic criteria? (that should specify attainment of an AB degree), then obviously Paul's point is extremely well taken. If, on the other hand, we could get rid of this kind of formal inherited definition, and say "a college-educated person," we might want to keep in mind something quite different from the kinds of things that most current innovative colleges are trying to accomplish. And I don't think you'd argue, Paul, that one could not evaluate those things well.

BROWN:

Take a field (like accounting) that's defined and specific as a skill. It is clear what the appropriate evaluations are, and one would surely find certain specific things about an adequate accountant and there would be very little argument among expert accountants as to what those specific things are. But, for example, how do you define, at this point in the development of psychology, what an adequate Bachelor's degree in psychology is? We just finished a nationwide study about what's happening in the psychology curriculum, and of course, what's happening turns out to be about 15 years out of date. These colleges are finally getting themselves mobilized to offer what the last study done 15 years ago suggested they ought to offer and now, naturally, these suggestions are to some extent obsolete. We may speak in terms of the formal definition of the field, but I prefer a more practical, if not necessarily a *better* definition, one which I developed: What do students taking these degrees intend to do with them? What do they want with them?

I would say that a lot of what we're arguing about could perhaps be resolved if we could agree that *evaluation is simply a technique of finding out whether you've arrived at some goal.* The real root of the problem is: How do you state what goal you want to arrive at? That's essentially a value judgment and one well worth making. I would hope that any who have started an innovative college have thought long and hard about what their goals are. The goals often turn out to be in the nature of the students' personality development; but it may turn out that they merely require them to master one foreign language at a higher level than that attained in the parent institution, or something that specific.

COMMENT:

I think we should definitely come back to that question of goals. From the institutions with which all of you have been involved, which goals seem to be attainable or useful or commend themselves to you, on a comparative basis with other institutions? But first, could you try to expand on these comments—on the question of additional data other than output measurements, particularly of student achievement, that should be used in evaluation or experimenting?

DRESSEL:

There are a couple of things that occurred to me while the other conversations were going on. You can define education, if you want to, as levels of knowledge—you can certify a possession or non-possession of knowledge and the possession or non-possession of various levels of skills. That's one sort of criterion. I don't think it describes adequately the richness or the barrenness of a particular educational experience a person might have had. You don't have to go to college to read a book or to look at a television set. Ordinarily, as a matter of fact, if you go to college you're less likely to look at a television set than your parents probably. But I'm not sure *that* really is a major problem of evaluating programs. Then, you have all kinds of other things involved: institutional ratings of various sorts and the kind of dynamics Bob Pace is talking about are part of the relevant information for evaluating a program.

HODGKINSON:

One of the things that's terribly important in determining the outcomes of higher education is the kind of people that come in. It sounds simple-minded to say so but this is one reason why Oberlin, for example, does very well in terms of getting Woodrow Wilson winners and having people going to graduate schools—because they have admitted nothing *but* potential Woodrow Wilson winners. Given that kind of set, and that kind of selectivity, the outcome is foretold. So you don't have to worry about performance measurement. I think what Bob Pace said is very much in line with the kind of comments that I feel are important right now.

I go to many institutions in which the nuts and bolts of the place don't add up to the commitments that you read in the first eight pages of the catalog. And you can sense that immediately. In the catalogs of many small colleges, for example, the first page will say "we care about only one thing and that is the individual student." Now the first experience the kid has when he hits the institution is registration, and he stands in line for three days and nobody knows his name and nobody cares to know him. That kind of thing, to me, is a useful and legitimate way of evaluating whether or not an institution is performing its stated objectives. That sort of thing does not negate the sort of performance objective that Paul was talking about or the holistic approach to evaluation that Bob spoke of; you might bring all these things together at the same time.

PACE:

I think we've been talking about two kinds of criteria: to some extent we've been talking about how to evaluate what is happening to the individual. But we're also talking about evaluating a *program* and an *institution*. And I think they're not entirely in the same domain.

COMMENT:

Could we get into some specifics? Have any of the men in the panel been invited to a campus to evaluate a program and how did you go about it? What were the results? Was the program enriched?

BROWN:

As for our present study: We started our college with an evaluation system built into the design of the college. For example, the admissions procedure was set up in such a way that the students would be a carefully selected random sample of the larger university and that allowed us to set up two control groups, matched person to person. We had an entrance criteria control group that volunteered for the college, but were not admitted, since we had over 2,000 volunteers and could only take 250 people in the first class. Those admitted were chosen in a random fashion to get a representative sample of the entering freshman class into the larger College of Literature, Science and the Arts.

So we had a second control group which was chosen from the rest of the student body of the parent institution that expressed no interest in being in the new college but matched on all other criteria. Then, we had an ethnographic observation team, if you will, who sort of lived in the place and wrote long descriptions of the ethos, the environment, the artifacts. We also have five control groups at five other universities across the country who were also doing this sort of thing. The team went to spend several weeks on each of these campuses writing ethnographic reports.

On any given issue we can point to differences as results. For example, if you're interested in questions of satisfaction on the part of the students, we have measures showing much greater satisfaction with certain specific variables such as faculty, or courses, or things of this sort. As far as attainment, we took measures of outcomes after the first class graduated. For example, we found that the students did somewhat better, by standard academic measures, than students in traditional university programs when they cross-registered in courses where they were graded in the parent college. You know—there are innumerable measures of this sort. Now, this term, the college was evaluated independently by a faculty committee from the parent college. They took into account all the psychological, personality, socio-psychological, sociometric data gathered by our study. They then collected all kinds of other data such as cost analyses and academic achievement and took testimony from satisfied and dissatisfied students and faculty. One result is a reaffirmation of the desire of the university to go on with the college, but to correct some of the important structural problems. And this is all I can say about this specific project because it's an ongoing project and the time here is too brief.

There have been four fairly long publications that are in the literature giving specific details comparing students and most of the data that have been published are the sort of thing Paul takes some exception to as being the type of evaluation that's not really useful; that is, these data tend to be almost solely directed toward personal growth, personality development, value change, ideological change and things of this sort. And they are extremely weak with respect to specifics of achievement or specifics in relating these to given classroom dynamics. There have been six Ph.D. dissertations written so far on this study, and a couple of them do deal with these more sociological factors—in fact, two of them are by sociologists and one by a political scientist. The interactions among students and faculty as predictors of actual achievement in subject matter relate strongly to felt satisfaction. (I think you'll rather like that).

HODGKINSON:

I want to say a word about the study I'm doing now, which is a study entitled: Title III Higher Education Act of 1965. This is $30 million a year which is going, I am told, primarily to upgrade the black colleges and bring them into "the mainstream of higher educational life." This seems to me the worst thing you could do, but that's what the money is for. It seems to me it would be much more interesting if some of that money were used to inculcate experiments in black colleges, to begin to develop some things that are indigenous to their needs rather than forcing our values or standards or programs on them. Anyway, the point of this study is to find out whether the allocation of $30 million a year of federal money makes a specific difference to the campus. One thing that does seem to pay off: While the findings are not yet available, there is the circulation of persons. That is, getting some new people in does tend to make a difference. What we're trying to do in that particular project is to present some guidelines to the institutions to indicate how they can make better use of an astonishing amount of money. So this is a consideration on the administration. The black colleges are very concerned. They're naive about how to spend the money. They're not good at it. As a matter of fact 30 per cent of the black colleges *return* money! You know—you give them $50,000 and they'll return some saying they didn't know how to spend it.

COMMENT:

I see a problem. Not all of us are out of the same kind of student cross-section—that of Ann Arbor (that is, residential)—

and don't fit into some of the programs that are here. That is, we admit a self-selected group of students who are already admitted to school, and our standards aren't anywhere near what Ann Arbor's are. And I see those at the Charter school as being—for the lack of a better phrase—"education freaks." That is, they are students who are attracted to a kind of program which makes them different in terms of their perceptions of their education. My problem is: How can I possibly "evaluate" an experiment in which the students *are not* typical? That is, what does success look like, when I know my students are "abnormal" to begin with?

BROWN:

That's a real problem and, of course, we have some very interesting findings, as one might expect. Interestingly enough, students change on a lot of these measures that we gave before they arrived, as soon as they were told that they were going to be in an experimental college. But there are statistical ways to try to control these things; they're not perfect but you do the best you can with these problems. They can be very technical problems. But your problem is a good one.

COMMENT:

The specific question is: Suppose an institution, an experimental program, tried something radical—like getting rid of all structures in the classroom for a year. What kinds of things do you look for at the end of the year to let you know whether doing that made sense?

PACE:

Whether or not the students found some structure themselves, which they usually do. By the way—what were your purposes? Obviously you must have had something that you thought could be better accomplished by doing that. When you can state that, then I will worry about trying to find a way to evaluate whether you've achieved that goal or not.

COMMENT:

All right. Fine. We believe, and our students believe, that it represented a better way of teaching students to learn for themselves. This is what education is all about anyway, and what it ought to be about. But the experiment was, we think, a disaster—you see, I'm not sure because I don't know what yardstick to use.

PACE:

Well, you've just stated it. You said: You thought that if students were in an environment that facilitated "learning for themselves," they would accomplish some goals which you didn't specify, but which you probably had in mind for Charter College. Perhaps they'd be more self-reliant, better able to go out and generalize whatever they did learn in unspecified situations in the future—and so on. The problem is that you can't state the criteria; but at least you can get some sort of measure of it. And again, you come back to this: For anything you do in the name of innovation it's incumbent upon you to ask yourself *why?* Otherwise why do it? If you can state why you're doing it, then you're a long way towards being able to state some way of evaluating it, because you are then specifying some outcomes, to some extent. One can argue about the value involved in the reaching of the outcomes, but that's not the issue at the moment. You're simply asking how do I know whether this was a good thing or a bad thing? And I say, it's a good thing or a bad thing depending on what you're trying to accomplish. And if you say the results are good; fine, then I'll say that's fine. It's good you accomplished that. But I have to know what it is you want before I can help you determine whether you've accomplished it.

COMMENT:

I'm rather concerned over the lack of *content* in the discussion of evaluation, with the exception of Dr. Dressel. What exactly are we evaluating?

PACE:

Evaluative process, or content; nobody said you shouldn't evaluate both.

COMMENT:

There is one thing I don't understand about the use of the word "control group" as you use it to do the kind of evaluation you're talking about. In order to really establish a control group, you'd have to take all those people who had applied and reject some of them to make sure the motivation is comparable in your control group and the group that goes on to college. And that if you don't do that, then you really don't have control groups. And, if you don't have control groups, you can't proceed with that kind of design. Could you elaborate?

BROWN:

It just so happens we're in the fortunate position of having to reject a majority of people who apply because we can't accommodate them. Maybe I didn't make it clear. Our college, like all large liberal arts units of large universities, has an enrollment of approximately 11,000 undergraduates. In our case, it's the College of Literature, Science and Arts of the University division. There'd be a comparable number at Michigan State, UCLA, etc. We offered an opportunity to participate in a particular program to 250 students. Nothing was said about the existence of this program until the students had applied in the normal manner to the College of Literature, Science and the Arts and had been accepted or rejected. So all of those who were accepted through the normal channels of the College of Literature, Science and Arts were offered the opportunity by simply checking a box to express their interest in an experimental residential college which was described in one short paragraph, along with a paragraph describing the Pilot Program which is another experimental program, or the honors college, if they qualified in terms of their SAT scores. Along with this question you're asked, "What housing do you prefer?" (They've already been admitted, you see). It so happened that approximately 2,000 of the approximately 4,000 entering students checked the option that they wanted the residential college. We could only take 250. So they were stratified on five demographic variables to get representative samples of the L.S. & A. class and chosen at random within the strata. So then we did have the group that volunteered as well as the group that didn't volunteer.

Now, if you're at Johnston College, you can't do that because your people applied directly to Johnston College rather than the University of Redlands. Then, you have to find some other way to get at these. There are a variety of ways of getting controls, and I don't mean to over-emphasize this problem of controls; it's not the only way to set up evaluational schemes. For certain purposes, it is the necessary way, but it all comes back to what questions you want to get answers to. So you can decide whether you want primarily sociological measures or whether you want predominantly psychometric assessment of content attainment—or whatever.

COMMENT:

A question was raised on which I think many of us might be interested to have all of your wisdom on. If an institution wants to do self-evaluation on some kind of continuing basis and doesn't have the resources to do a massive or totalistic evaluation, what kind of data does each of you think is most useful, most relevant to your work to get some kind of indicator or general evaluation of the college?

DRESSEL:

I don't want to give the impression that I am heavily content-oriented in terms of evaluation. In fact, one of our biggest problems is that evaluation somehow gets separated from process. Let's take something like the ability to independently pursue learning; suppose I would like to enunciate this as the major outcome of an experimental college, if I were to found one. By the senior year, every person who gets a degree would have to demonstrate ability to use at least half of his time profitably on an independently determined project which he carried out and submitted for approval. Now I wouldn't worry about giving an A, B, C, or D; I would worry a little bit about whether it was a well-based job. But if done, it's accomplished; then its *existence* is an evaluation. If I come in from the outside to look at the program, the faculty can give me these products. I've seen this on a few campuses. The faculty says: "Here's what our seniors are doing and this chap did this all on his own, in his senior year." Fine, that's the evidence right there; it's the evidence that the student attained the objective. And anybody who gets out of that college who hasn't increased in his level of ability to perform in such a manner has been cheated.

COMMENT:

I'd be interested in comments from the rest of you—what kind of data you find most useful; what, in your experience, tells you most?

HODGKINSON:

The answer to the question depends on whether you mean a liberal arts college or West Point. Evaluation has to be individual to the campus. And I would love to see the experts go out of business. I wish campuses would develop more evaluation competences themselves. Faculty in liberal arts colleges have a lot of competences that could be used for evaluation and yet we continuously go out and hire outsiders to do it. There are no national monolithic evaluational standards or norms that will apply everywhere.

COMMENT:

The question doesn't presuppose monolithic national norms that in every case should be applied. It does presuppose for the people here that there may be some commonality which Sarah Lawrence and West Point wouldn't have but which experimenting institutions may have. Obviously, that's an open question. But for experimenting institutions, do you see any commonality that suggests the most helpful places to focus?

HODGKINSON:

We're talking about the universe of institutions that align themselves politically into groups like "unions" or "experimentation," right? If that's what we're talking about, then, I think you can say a few things—that these institutions do talk about independence—accounting for the fact that a lot of them have the kind of things that Paul talked about—the senior thesis, etc. For example, the senior year is when you work with a mentor. That seems to me the kind of thing about which you could develop some behavioral notions about whether the person achieved in that area or not. Another thing about experimental projects is that they tend to occur on campuses that are white and middle class; and the parents of children who go into experimental colleges tend to come from professional backgrounds.

COMMENT:

I'm wondering if really, in the final analysis, the question that experimenting colleges have to ask is more "How can the process of evaluation affect our education?" rather than "How can the thing we're evaluating be looked at and said it's better or worse?"

PACE:

Your tendency to say, "Is it a good or a bad plan?" is difficult to answer. In the long run what you come down to is that it's a good thing to try to do because it's a *particular kind* of learning experience that has a lasting impact on the people who participate in it. Now I would say the same thing about *local institutional evaluation*—the coming together to talk about goals and consequences—deciding what would be relevant information and how far we have to go to satisfy ourselves that we've been adequate in the way we intended.

At some point or other you need people who know a little about some aspect of methodology, whether it's a sociological, psychological, or economic inquiry or whatever it might be. I don't identify, let's say, the chemistry professor as automatically the world's best expert in constructing an educational achievement test or questionnaire to measure personality development. There are some people who are experienced in that, and I think you ought to use them. The process of evaluation requires the participation of many people in the institution to determine what you want to evaluate, what you think is relevant and what you think is adequate. Then ultimately when you have some information that's related to *all* the things we've been talking about, *they* again are the ones in the end who have to say what it means. Does that get to your question, or do you want to pursue that?

COMMENT:

I guess I'm thinking about the grading system as being evaluation. The grading system itself has had a very negative effect on grading students. How can you say that the *outcomes* of the evaluation are much less important than what kinds of conversations you get going, and what kinds of ways that stimulate people to think about a better situation?

BROWN:

Two little experiences about this question of the continuous feedback of the evaluation process itself are available. On the one hand, of course, you have the kind of evaluation that you mention—grading vs. written evaluations. The defense is that it gives out more information, allows the student to understand what his development has been in that content area, and so on and so forth. When we were doing the Vassar study some years ago it involved, as our current study does too, intensive interviewing of a sub-sample of students. Now, at that time, this was a rather new idea; not interviewing, but pursuing students through a longitudinal set of interviews while in college. The question arose as to whether we might be doing these students great harm by interfering in their lives by these interviews. We were quite anxious to know; and of course, it turned out that the very process of participating in this kind of self-examination was a beneficial experience, certainly, for the institution as a whole. When we wrote up the first report in 1956, published in the *Journal of Social Issues* called "Personality Development in the College Years" there were all kinds of levels of effects on the institution and you had this continuous feedback that you don't have any control over. But you've got to, in fact, accept that this will happen.

COMMENT:

In some sense students and faculty and administration in an institution—I take it from much of what you've said—can and should do their own evaluating, without relying on experts. Now, in the context of that observation, what does each of you see as the contribution, the role, that experts in evaluation can make—the contribution that *you* can make to its continuing process? Are you willing to vote yourself out of existence?

HODGKINSON:

No, not quite. I know some parent institutions that now have committees on analytical studies composed of students, faculty and administrators. (One of the best examples, is Lawrence College). You have these groups begin to conduct these studies. They can use any kind of resources they want including technical help—and at that point I'd love to come in as a technician, to help clarify their objectives. If we want them to feel responsible for the results—and right now they don't—*they* must be in charge. If the study is not their own they're perfectly willing to reject the whole thing and they have a lot of reasons for doing that; whereas, if it's *theirs,* I think that the impact would be very different.

DRESSEL:

I'd like to comment on this because I think there's another problem to be faced up to; one, I know some of the institutions here are facing. There are, after all, accrediting agencies throughout the country. I know some people think we ought to get rid of them. But I've done enough of this over the years so that I'm convinced that accreditation plays a significant role in improving education and in protecting the public. I think there has to be some kind of an external audit carried on. And I would very much commend the idea that an institution in some way engage in internal evaluation which results in continuing feedback and improvement in the program. This is my major interest in evaluation. But I also believe that for general public service and protection there has to be some kind of external auditing agency; and I prefer to see some kind of accrediting system such as we have in this country, rather than governmental control such as those in existence in other countries.

HODGKINSON:

I have no objection to that. The problem of the accrediting associations is that nobody wants them in. The regional association is entirely on it's own; they don't report to anybody, nobody checks out *their* performance. But with that one exception, I agree with Paul.

DRESSEL:

Bud, I'd like to point out that the regional accreditation associations are dominated by the institutions that are in the region. They don't exist separately from the institution.

HODGKINSON:

That's partly true; I don't think they represent *all* spectrums of the institutions: They don't represent the instructors; they represent the full professors. They don't represent the janitors who work in the institutions; they represent the deans and presidents. They're administratively loaded. Maybe that's the way the people should represent institutions, but I think some national investigating/accrediting association could be a very useful thing in line with providing more valuable data to improve their performance.

COMMENT:

Would any of you want to make comments about what you see as the contribution that can be made by outside evaluators in spite of the fact that some kind of in-house evaluation seems to be emerging as a necessity from all of you?

HODGKINSON:

I think we do two kinds of things: First, I've been involved in making judgments about higher education as a complex system involving hundreds of institutions. And you do have a more formalized approach—not a gathering of all the faculty members together from the problem institution at a big convention so it can be talked about. Actually what you're doing there is taking a look as a social scientist and an educator at a hard phenomenon. And that is a kind of external evaluation that presumably is informed by whatever your scholarship and ideas and philosophies are.

That is clearly somewhat different from a local institution's self-evaluation where part of the purpose is itself an educative one and a procedure for stimulating change. One of the things that happens when you get a lot of people involved in a self-study and they come up with some recommendations and conclusions is that they're still around there and nobody can ignore those recommendations. (If they do, don't let them get another self-study for at least 15 years). Although this does sometimes happen, they're not as much ignored as some of the external ones are. If you really get people invoved in it, students, administrators, faculty, trustees, etc. over a period of time—not just a dribble here and there but a real effort at an appropriate time (unless all the people leave the campus in a hurry afterwards),—they're sure going to do something to improve it. And they can't be ignored by the administration, by the trustees, or their colleagues.

SESSION 4:

POWER AND DECISION-MAKING IN EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGES*

Conveners: **Thomas C. Greening**
Arthur Wiener

I'd like to make a preliminary observation about power and decision-making in general so we can get a sense of the dynamics generated in the experimental situation.

Experimental colleges are often dedicated to functioning as participatory democracies and as living-learning communities with faculty and students being co-learners, and sometimes with trust, encounter, openness, self-disclosures, humanistic caring, affective learning, and consensus decision-making as valued means and ends. Entranced with these ideals, and high on the rich experiences which can thus be generated, we may forget that power games can evolve within such paradises, and be thrust upon them from without. If we do forget this, we can nevertheless count upon being rudely reminded of it by the unfolding of events. The history of experimental colleges could be written by charting the ways in which they dealt with, or, too often and to their peril, failed to deal with, power issues.

A definition of power is needed at this point, to distinguish it from other kinds of interventions which may be more congruent with the avowed principles of experimental colleges. I am using the term "power" in this context to mean those actions in which one person or faction moves unilaterally and coercively in preference to genuine efforts at negotiation, dialogue, compromise, or caring for the wishes, needs and values of others. The power user pursues his own goal rather than searching for collaborative relationships or cooperation with his opponents. Facilitation of mutual fulfillment for diverse individuals or groups is regarded as less important than fulfillment of his own objectives. He enters into a win-lose contest, abandoning attempts to find a win-win solution. Dominance and force are used in place of efforts to create synergy. The freedom and humanness of the opponent are reduced as an end result of the power move itself, and also during the process of the power move. This is especially true if it includes the use of secrecy and surprise so that the victim is even robbed of the opportunity for a fair fight.

---

*This paper is a revised and expanded version of a presentation made at the Johnston College National Symposium on Experimental Higher Education, January, 1972. It incorporates contributions made by participants in the discussion. Although the session was co-convened by Thomas Greening and Arthur Wiener, Thomas Greening authored this session in its present form.

An example may illustrate this. Suppose a board of trustees wishes to fire a college president for what it feels are good reasons. It has several choices. It can tell him of the data, thoughts and feelings which make it want to fire him, and invite him to change or respond. It can appeal to some third party to mediate the conflict. It can try to set him up so that he will choose to quit, or do something that will "justify" firing him. It can simply fire him. It can give an honest or dishonest explanation for why it fired him. These options involve choices as to how much unilateral power the trustees want to use. The basic aspect of power usage is that it avoids or breaks a relationship of direct confrontation, self-disclosure, and encounter in which both parties retain opportunities to express their humanness. Firing someone and ejecting him from a relationship destroys his capacity to function humanly in that context.

An extreme example of this would be if I were to kill an opponent as a means of expressing my anger and asserting my will over him. If I stopped short of killing him (ending his humanness) and instead told him I was so angry at him I had fantasies of killing him, but made no move to do so, I would preserve his autonomy and humanness. He would retain the opportunity to express himself back to me. The decision of the "winners" in the Kent State killings was that allowing the humanness of the students to continue was less valuable than upholding other principles, such as a particular concept of "order." According to my definition, expressing that value preference in an angry verbal confrontation would not be a use of power, because the students would remain alive and capable of opposing the view with their own. Expressing it by killing ends the conflict unilaterally.

I am not judging the use of power as good or bad here. That judgment has to be made by each person based on his values regarding the preservation of the humanness of everyone in the conflict, versus the resolution of the conflict in accordance with other values he holds. Treatment of people as expendable means or as ends in themselves is a complex moral issue I have discussed elsewhere in an analysis of existential fiction (Greening, 1963).

My use of the term power differentiates it from concepts such as effectiveness, competence, or impactfulness. We are familiar with phrases such as "the power of words" or "he is a powerful speaker." That usage does not fall within the definition I am using here, because it does not describe unilateral, coercive interventions. Effectiveness at self-expression, however, is certainly one of the best weapons against power, provided it is accompanied by ability to detect power moves in time to counter them.

People who overtly renounce authoritarian methods sometimes are unaware of the covert manipulation they resort to instead. Educators, allegedly being dedicated to "noble" purposes such as educating youth or pursuing the truth, may be tempted to suppose themselves innocent of baser motives, especially if they have left "bad," power-ridden, traditional colleges and come to "good," enlightened experimental colleges. The very word "experimental" implies an open, receptive, non-authoritarian approach. Similarly, students who seek out such colleges often suppose themselves to have transcended the rat race for establishment status via skill-training in American power games. And the original founders of an experimental college usually credit themselves with a permissive, flexible, expanded vision and trust in what education can be if given sufficient freedom and support.

These virtues and high intentions are laudable, and when integrated with realistic assessments of oneself and the world, form the basis of vitally needed educational innovations and renewal. Because I value such ideals and experiments so highly, I feel all the more protective and saddened when I see them founder due to blindness or duplicity. Education above all should be a process of learning about the nature of man and his interactions, and about his growth potential and the barriers to growth. Life in an experimental college can provide some extremely vivid—and painful—learning of this kind.

Some of my personal history may be relevant here to explain the background of my interest in these problems. I was raised in a middle-class Protestant home which emphasized such virtues as unselfish service, impulse control, gentle kindness, intellectual mastery of emotion, and loyalty to and trust in the WASP community. As a youth I worked for organizations such as the Y.M.C.A. and the American Friends Service Committee. Later I entered the mental health field which exemplified in somewhat different form the focus on attaining virtue through self-control and contributing to the welfare of others. I have worked as a consultant to organizations such as clinics, hospitals, church organizations, and colleges which allegedly exist to serve, not exploit.

In all these places I have met many fine people who much of the time were authentic and congruent in their dedication. But when the heat was on I have also seen many of these same people, and others not so authentic and congruent, play very tricky games with themselves, their colleagues, and the people they served. A woman in a group I was leading once put her insight into herself this way, "I live to serve others—you can tell the others by their hunted look."

To my dismay, and often to my disadvantage, I have found myself the unsuspecting and untrained participant in some very harsh power plays. Raw weapons such as physical, legal, or financial coercion were not overtly used as in the "selfish materialistic" world. In fact, their use could cost the user points in a more sophisticated game, a game in which subtler weapons such as guilt, identity tampering and double binds are used. The ultimate game, of course, is the one in which we pretend there is no game. R.D. Laing has summed this up concisely in his book *Knots* (1970):

> They are playing a game. They are playing at not playing a game. If I show them I see they are, I shall break the rules and they will punish me. I must play their game, of not seeing I see the game.

After a few rounds of that sort I wondered if life in the Mafia might be more honest and simple. At least the goals, power structure, rules and penalties are clear, and the training of young members is directly relevant to the organizational realities. But of course, in these complex times, even the Mafia is having its internal troubles.

My experiences sensitized me to the problems of what psychologists call the "return of the repressed." That is, selfish impulses can infiltrate past defenses and emerge in new forms often without the awareness of the person attempting to do good. And at the organizational level, the sheer complexity of providing arrangements for diverse individuals to collaborate invites perceptions and plans which oversimplify the problem in ways advantageous to the initiators. Naive or idealistic tendencies to overlook these dangers can leave people vulnerable and not competent to cope with their own and others' power in creative ways. For example, various individuals or factions may have different conceptions of participatory democracy, and different degrees of commitment to it. When critical decisions, crisis, or power vacuums develop, rapid and unexpected responses may occur at different levels in the college organization, revealing flaws in the communal agreements regarding power.

Goal setting, goal implementing, evaluation, allocation of scarce resources, accountability, cohesiveness, and authority are issues requiring realistic and explicit solutions. Under the pressures of time, budget and multilateral experimentation, these issues are often insufficiently dealt with, leaving openings for chaos, exploitation, cop-outs, and fascism. For experimental colleges to fulfill their promise, these problems must be faced openly, not hidden beneath reassuring fantasies. Transcendence of power games in order to pursue educational means and ends such as democracy, trust, freedom, community and self-actualization can best be furthered by realistic knowledge of the trade-off benefits and costs of various power strategies.

Here is a list of some types of power, coercion or influence used at colleges:

1. Logical argument. Appeals to reason. Intellectual persuasion.
2. Appeals to hallowed precedent. "This is how we do things here." Tradition. "It has worked before; why tamper with a good thing?"
3. Appeals to "good educational practice" or "principles of modern teaching."
4. Claims that one's proposed action best fulfills the essence of the educational experiment.
5. Asserting the prerogatives of academic freedom.
6. Reference to the AAUP code.
7. Emotional exhortation and confrontation.
8. Social acceptance and rejection.
9. Humor: ridicule, parody, shaming.
10. Giving or withholding money.
11. Giving or withholding administrative support.
12. Firing, reappointing, granting or refusing tenure.
13. Pronouncing moral judgments. Praise or blame as good or bad according to some norm.
14. Exposure or threats to expose embarrassing information.
15. Martyrdom: conspicuous, righteous suffering.
16. Civil law: lawsuits, restraining orders, etc.

17. Criminal or martial law: calling in police or soldiers.

18. Physical occupation or blockage.

19. Killing (e.g., Kent State).

Readers can probably supply additional strategies from their own experiences.

The list is also long of those factions or blocs which may wield power. In addition to the obvious ones such as students, faculty, and administration, we need to consider the values and methods of alumni, parents, accrediting agencies, local law-enforcement agencies, townspeople, etc.

On top of that, there are what we might call inexorable impersonal forces which press upon colleges, limit the freedom of the participants, and demand responses. Included would be such forces as wear and tear on physical facilities from use, weather, or calamities like the fire at the original Old Westbury Campus. Budget constraints can be aggravated by a stock market recession reducing endowments or by failure to obtain a hoped for grant. Intrusion by germs, outside thieves, or national policy decisions can take their toll of resources. Graduate school entrance requirements have changed some to accommodate graduates of experimental colleges, but those hurdles still loom large as impersonal power vectors largely outside the range of negotiation.

Of all these problems, however, the most dramatic confrontation seems to arise out of conflicts inherent in situations where some people are established and others are experimenting. Education is by nature a subversive, disruptive activity. It encourages people to question, explore and experiment. People who have already formed viewpoints, knowledge systems and life-styles which satisfy them may be threatened by people who are studying and innovating. Most of what goes by the name of education is really brainwashing, preaching and skill-training. People who give huge amounts of money and personal effort to establish and run colleges often tend to do so in order to perpetuate their values and life-support systems. Often they are bitterly disappointed. Herbert Denenberg, the insurance commissioner of Pennsylvania known for attacking insurance companies, did much of his work while holding a university professorship endowed by those very companies. He says that was the "worst investment those bastards ever made (*Time,* July 10, 1972)."

In other places benefactors have been quicker to see that their hand was being bitten by the mouth they were feeding. The trustees of Federal City College in Washington, D.C., under pressure from Senator Tydings of Maryland, fired the president and provost for allowing too much militancy. Later, the budget was cut $360,000 by Senator Byrd and the Senate Appropriations Committee, again in reaction to militancy (Roberts, 1969). The Oyster Bay campus of New York's State University at Old Westbury was abruptly closed after officials in Albany appointed an evaluation committee which conducted a two day assessment. Old Westbury had been announced as a college which would offer "an almost unrestricted opportunity for innovation" in which students would have "full partnership." Tom Powers, in his "Autopsy on Old Westbury" (Powers, 1971) says, "Given a student body deliberately recruited for its interest in educational experiment and social change, power conflicts were inevitable, especially since the 'full partnership' idea was never well defined. Power seemed to be there for the taking, and everybody reached at once."

Similar problems developed at Johnston College and there were times when it seemed possible that the experiment would be terminated. Finally, after a series of clashes, the trustees fired the chancellor. Although the real reason was never made public, my own feeling is that they concluded he was not serving the purposes of Johnston students and faculty enough for them to want him retained.

A related case involves Herbert Blau, the original provost of the California Institute of the Arts and one of its principal spiritual architects, who was forced out after a dispute with the trustees. Blau had tried to anticipate the power clash he saw built into the Cal Arts design. He saw it as "a very innovative group of people with fairly searching ideas . . . being endowed by people who would be constitutionally suspicious of that . . . . Indeed, everybody tried to anticipate these conflicts. Nobody has been scornful of the basic Disney claim upon the Institute. If I gave nearly $50 million to endow an institute I'd feel I had some rights in the matter." The attempt to clarify the extent of those rights failed. Blau felt betrayed, and concluded, "Here you have people (trustees) who are constantly absorbed with what they take to be the immoral behavior of students and faculty, who themselves take actions that correspond to nothing that any of us would recognize as moral law. You worry about nudity of other people and you violate contracts (Sullivan, 1971)."

So it goes around the country. In most cases those who win the power games are convinced that they have acted in good conscience to affirm higher values which they are uniquely qualified and responsible to uphold. For example, it seems clear to me that, at a church oriented university like University of Redlands (where Johnston is located) this sense of the white man's burden is amplified by Christian righteousness. But religion is only one of the dogmas available to lend an aura of virtue to power maneuvers. The radical left and the adherents of self-directed unstructured learning also sometimes seem to be claiming divine inspiration. Blau himself admits, "You can't ignore the paranoia of the radical left in this . . . . Some of the people experimenting with the more idiot ends of the new life-style insisted on running tests on the Disneys instead of doing the work." But Blau argues that developing new art forms requires gifted, sometimes over-sensitive people and a great deal of testing out of new expressions. In response to the criticism that his administration had been too lenient and had not exercised enough centralized control, he asserted that "insofar as anything is really controllable on a campus today, it's really by some kind of wise discourse, insofar as you have any wisdom, with your students and faculty, each of whom has natural and passionate impulses of his own, particularly in the environment that we were asked to create."

It is this kind of wise discourse which is so difficult to establish and for which we are so poorly prepared. The course work at Johnston is typically agreed upon through contract negotiation between students and teachers. To try to alert people to the issues and processes involved, I drew up the following questions which I believe the negotiators need to face:

1. Is the contract agreed on mutually between two parties of equal power? Do they both have sufficient skill and self-knowledge to negotiate a contract that fits their capacities and wishes? (Nierenberg, 1968; Karrass, 1970).
2. What are the issues which are important enough that they should be dealt with by negotiation of contracts between equals?
3. Do both parties feel equal "ownership," or motivation to honor the contract?
4. How much time and trouble are both parties willing to invest in negotiating contracts? If negotiation time and motivation run out for one or both parties, what happens? Is there a "back-stop contract" which remains in effect until a new one is negotiated?
5. If one party violates the contract unilaterally, what happens? Is there a contract for dealing with broken contracts? e.g., Do both parties remain equal in subsequent negotiations? Or, does enforcement power revert to whoever held to the original contract?
6. How specific and concrete are the clauses of the contract? Trade-offs: More structure in a contract gives more clarity of communication, but may force it into rigid, formal, simplistic requirements. Less structure gives more freedom and flexibility for personal growth and exploration, but it may allow chaos and lack of encounter and communication.
7. What process is there for both parties to verify that they see the contract the same way? Is it written?
8. How will it be determined that both parties have fulfilled the contract?

9. Separate from the specifics of the contract, what is the basic purpose of it? Excellence in learning? Free personal growth? Meeting formal requirements?
10. Does the contract grow out of and enhance a creative relationship between two parties, or is it a substitute for creative communication and a barrier to creative changes?
11. Is there a provision for outside facilitation, mediation, or arbitration if some phase of the contract negotiation or implementation breaks down? Is there a clause which binds the parties to accept the results of arbitration? How would the arbitrators be selected?

As I look over these questions, it seems to me that they also apply to the people involved in founding and running experimental colleges. Ambiguities in these question areas set the stage for power plays to exploit the situation, to reduce uncomfortable ambiguity, or to provide structure when indecision is seen as dangerous.

Here are examples of some of the problems that had to be solved in the early phases of Johnston College:

1. Dorms and other buildings had to be designed and built.
2. Living-learning rules had to be created and a governance system developed to enforce them.
3. Courses had to be set up, and resources such as faculty, classroom space, money and time slots had to be allocated.
4. Progress had to be evaluated, and accreditation standards met.
5. Decisions had to be made about hiring and re-hiring of faculty.

And here are some of the questions that were not always confronted realistically:

1. Have the participants agreed on a priority list of problems and committed themselves to solving them or accepting the solutions of those delegated to solve them?

2. Is there a common awareness of the seriousness of the problems and the penalties for failing to solve them?
3. Is there a realistic assessment of available competence and motivation to solve the problems?
4. Does everyone agree about how much authority has been delegated to whom, and how autonomy and accountability are allocated?
5. What is the deadline for decision and action? Is it possible to solve the problems in the time left?
6. Who really has the ultimate power to decide, if negotiations fail or time runs out?

In the case of living-learning autonomy, ambiguity and conflict erupted in the opening days of Johnston. The chancellor maintained that the experiment's essence included a commitment to merging the living and formal educational experiences, so that dormitory interactions and community meetings could be integral parts of learning, complementing that which also took place in classrooms. Johnston's academic autonomy within the University of Redlands thereby was perceived by the chancellor to include autonomy in living rules and governance. This was only true within limits, as the university president pointed out to the shock and dismay of the Johnston people at a tense meeting before classes began. The limits were that student life (self-governance, visiting hours, separation of sexes in dorms) would be subject to overall university policies. Students had selected Johnston based on conflicting printed and verbal information and felt betrayed. At this point it was necessary for JC faculty, administration and students to reexamine the extent to which this experimental college was someone else's experiment and to what extent theirs.*

---

*The By-laws specify this as follows: "The governance of Johnston College shall be vested in the Board of Trustees of the University of Redlands except in the following areas in which authority has been delegated to the Board of Overseers of Johnston College: (1) Admissions criteria; (2) Graduation requirements; (3) Content of instruction and learning; (4) Organization of educational program, methods of teaching and learning, instructional styles, and methods of evaluating these and reporting achievement to those concerned; (5) Employment of faculty and other staff for Johnston College, provided that contract conditions shall be the same as for the rest of the University of Redlands" (p. 1, Bylaws).

Attempts were made to compromise and transcend recriminations, but this clash was symptomatic of problems that were to persist. When it came time to decide on which faculty would be re-appointed, the principle of autonomy in hiring faculty was assaulted directly—and was preserved intact by the chairman of its board of overseers. This again was a symptom of the larger problem of the separation of academic autonomy from living autonomy. When the chancellor was subsequently fired by the university trustees, some at Johnston felt that as a cluster college their academic autonomy—symbolized in the chancellor—was an experimental variable under the control of the trustees, and not a basic parameter in a separate Johnston experiment. The relation between power, autonomy and accountability was unclear.**

This example illustrates a fundamental issue for experimental colleges: Whose experiment is it? Who are the experimenters, and who are the subjects? Many Johnston students were confused about this, and came thinking they would participate in the design, implementation, and evaluation of their education. They found, as the faculty had found, that this was not entirely true. They were also expected to participate in the implementation of an experiment which others had designed and which others would evaluate.

**"The Chancellor is responsible for the day-to-day operation of Johnston College and is invested with full authority over students, faculty, and other staff members of Johnston College within the policies established by the Board of Overseers of Johnston College and the Board of Trustees of the University. He is accountable to the Board of Overseers for those functions of Johnston College administration in which the Board of Overseers has authority as provided in these Bylaws; he shall have authority as necessary for the execution of this responsibility over the staff of the University charged with assisting him in carrying out these duties. He shall be accountable to the President of the University in all functions of the administration of Johnston College for which authority has not been delegated to the Board of Overseers as provided herein, and for the administration of those areas in which the Board of Overseers has authority as provided herein in a manner which is consistent with the objectives and policies of the University as a whole; he shall at all times keep the President fully informed on all matters affecting the President's overall responsibility for the operation of the University" (p. 7, Bylaws).

Personal growth laboratories were a basic part of the original design, as one way to implement confluent education. Some faculty and students were unclear about or uncommitted to confluent education and group encounter methods, and did not support the experiment. This highlights the problem of trying to conduct an experiment which requires informed consent and sustained involvement on the part of participants who were not selected on that basis.

Similarly, during one attempt to evaluate the Johnston experiment, problems arose because the evaluating agency, the Wright Institute, came to be seen by Johnston people as employed by the university trustees, serving the trustees' purposes, and adopting the trustees' value system regarding education and the evaluation process. The Wright Institute's initial report, in rough draft, seemed to support this view. But the Institute later concluded that the report suffered methodological difficulties—and was subsequently completely re-written. The Johnston community, having learned that if evaluation isn't done from within it will be done from without, launched an intensive and extensive self-evaluation which met with unanimous approval by administration, faculty and students.

One important lesson to be learned from such a case history is that avoidance of communication about power conflicts, passive trust, or naive optimism regarding evaluation or other problems simply will not work, given the complexity of forces operating in and around an experimental college. Indeed, deliberate blindness, procrastination, or unresponsiveness can be power maneuvers in themselves, used to thwart others who are trying to come to grips with conflicts, albeit in heavy-handed ways. Fenichel (1953) has described this tactic as used by psychotherapy patients, and it can also be seen in Camus' novel *The Stranger* (Greening, 1967). Extreme examples of manipulations perpetrated by "victims" can be found in a book by Houts, *They Asked for Death*.

In the previously cited example of the budget cut at Federal City College, Roberts points out that "as a result of political naiveté and an apparent administrative mixup, no one from the college or the city government appeared at the committee hearings to justify the requested appropriations." One may still regret that the funds were cut, but it is clear that the responsibility must be shared by victim as well as aggressor.

Encouragingly, there is a trend for young people, including those in the counter-culture, to forego the rewards of martyrdom and seek workable solutions. McGovern's primary campaign provided an opportunity for this shift, and we may hope that similar opportunities can be created in college contexts. Patrick Johnston, a twenty-five year old probation officer and delegate to the Democratic convention, put it his way:

> What this nomination and election represent is a test of whether the liberal and young are willing to win. There are a lot of people involved in the campaign who have a sort of suicidal urge to lose. The reason is that in losing you can prove you're right because in losing you never have to see your man compromise (*Time,* July 17, 1972).

The point I want to stress is that everyone involved, not just the leaders, needs to take creative steps to prevent the eruption of destructive power clashes or the cold war of passivity versus nagging. At an organizational level, clear initial understandings about the rights and responsibilities of all participants can reduce the ambiguous situations which may tempt some people to usurp prerogatives (Dressel and Faricy, 1972). If a college president and the board of trustees agree at the beginning on their rights and responsibilities, there will be fewer gray areas where the trustees can claim the president has failed to fulfill his duties, or where the president can claim he has autonomy contrary to the trustees' expectations.

Similarly, by recognizing the inevitability of evaluation in one form or another, all parties involved can see the need to seek each other out as early as possible and develop open communication about the evaluation process and criteria, and the use of the evaluation report.

Commitment to an encounter contract and skill in implementing it are other important ways to insure that negotiations in experimental colleges will respect the humanness of everyone involved. Then, when differences arise, the participants know they can count on each other to take the time, thought, and emotional energy to work toward a resolution openly and without recourse to force or deception. This kind of contract requires much negotiation and confrontation time, plus skill in expressing, listening, and creating compromises, plus faith that the differences will ultimately permit some kind of reconciliation.

Few people come to college as students or staff with adequate preparation for this method. Students are often too young to have learned the skills or seen results to support a faith in the approach. Faculty are often people who seek autonomy and intellectual pursuits in preference to group controversy. Administrators are often people who have learned to play power games in academic environments not conducive to authentic personal encounters. For these reasons, it is unrealistic to expect that an experimental college can be created by fiat without special efforts to select and train the participants so that they can pursue their goals without resorting to power. This is especially true of the original participants—those who found the college and who will be the most tempted to fall back on vested or usurped power to implement their dream.

Consensus decision-making is sometimes used at experimental colleges in an attempt to enable everyone to feel "ownership" of decisions and to avoid win-lose voting contests between a majority and minority. Problems arise because of the amount of time necessary to hear all objectives to a proposal and to modify it so as to achieve consensus. In a very heterogeneous college, values and needs may be so diverse that consensus is very difficult to achieve. Consensus should not be confused with unanimity, as sometimes occurs among people seeking harmony and who are naive about interpersonal differences. Consensus means that everyone agrees that the proposal is the best one available, given the realities of conflicting factions and insufficient time to seek a better solution. Some people may find the decision very unpleasant but agree to support it because time and the capacity to generate better decisions have been exhausted. To participate in consensus decision-making may require more existential sophistication and self-transcendence than can be found in a college community, or even a Zen monastery.

As was true at Johnston, in a new college there may be a huge number of decisions to be made. This may also be true in a college challenged by important changes, such as in the life styles and political consciousness of the students. At such times the problem of flooding or over-load can occur. Too many decisions may have to be made in too short a time by people who lack sufficient energy, skill and commitment to the decision-making processes. The organizational system, the interpersonal trust and communication system, and individual ego capacities may be overloaded with more complex and intense experiences than can be processed effectively. I well remember my own fatigue and distress in response to the over-load I experienced while consulting during the opening days of Johnston College. Whereas after working in highly structured settings with uptight people I have often turned to rock music as a refreshing counter-balance, at Johnston my solace was Mozart!

Under those kinds of "noise" or discordant conditions, power often reverts to those who have sheer staying power, that is, the capacity to resolve inner tension, erect defenses against it, or simply endure it. People who care too much, for selfish or altruistic reasons, about a specific immediate outcome may be unable to tolerate the frustration of prolonged hassling. People with more modest visions, or with their bets hedged, or with a basically disruptive orientation can outlast the others. For truly innovative experimental colleges to survive without compromises toward manageable mediocrity, basic changes must occur in the interpersonal orientations and skills of the people involved. Capacity for negotiation, encounter and consensus decision-making; respect for affect as well as logic, for fantasy as well as precedent; comprehension of large group processes—these are some of the assets which people must bring to experimental colleges, and which must be developed as essential components of each experiment. With a commitment to these processes, the colleges may succeed in that greatest experiment of them all—the attempt to rise above power struggles and to create a community of seekers.

REFERENCES

"The Battle for The Democratic Party," *Time,* July 17, 1972, 13-14.

Dressel, P. & Faricy, W., *Return to Responsibility,* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Fenichel, O., "An Infantile, Preliminary Phase of 'Defiance by Lack of Affect,' " In *The Collected Papers of Otto Fenichel, First Series,* New York: Norton, 1953.

Greening, T.; "Existential Fiction and the Paradox of Ethics," *The Antioch Review,* 1963, *23,* 93-107.

Greening, T., "Albert Camus: Authenticity vs. Alienation," In J.F.T. Bugental (Ed.), *Challenges of Humanistic Psychology,* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Greening, T., "Confluent Education Through Group Methods," mimeographed paper, 1971.

Honey, J., "Will the Faculty Survive?," *Change,* June, 1972, *4* (5), 24-29.

Houts, M., *They Asked for Death,* New York: Cowles, 1970.

Johnston College, "Guide for Applicants," 1969-70, Redlands, Calif.: University of Redlands, 1969.

Karrass, C., *The Negotiating Game,* New York: World, 1970.

Laing, R. D., *Knots,* New York: Random House, 1970.

Nierenberg, G., *The Art of Negotiating,* New York: Hawthorn Books, 1968.

Powers, T., "Autopsy on Old Westbury," *Harper's Magazine,* September, 1971, 52-61.

Roberts, W., "Federal City: Prospects for the Common College," *Change,* Nov., Dec., 1, (6), 44-52.

Sullivan, D., "Blau Becomes Disenchanted with Disney's Dream," *Los Angeles Times Calendar,* October 17, 1971.

"They Are All Afraid of Herb the Horrible," *Time,* July 10, 1972, 80-82.

SESSION 5:

PARTICIPATIVE EDUCATION*

Conveners: **James Doxsey**
Albert Wight

ALBERT WIGHT:

I've been working with the development and definition of participative education for around ten years, and trying in various ways to influence institutions to move in this direction, which is a tough job as you all know.

JAMES DOXSEY:

I'm working with Al at the Interstate Educational Resource Service Center on an affective education project. I've been working with the implementation of participative education for many years, mostly in Peace Corps training, but have had some experience with it in other applications.

WIGHT:

Before we launch into a discussion of participative education, we would like to run through a very brief exercise, so that we're pretty much together and starting from a common point. Is that O.K. with the group?

I think one thing we must consider is that in education we have to deal with changes that are taking place in the world, not just in education. What's happening around us, the turmoil in the schools, the changes in education, is a reflection of what's happening in society at large. This, I feel, we need to take a good look at, to bring what's happening in the schools into proper perspective. So let's brainstorm very quickly some of the things we see in the world today that either demand or suggest change in education.

---

* See Appendix, p. 123, for handout given to participants to read before this session.

Table 1

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WORLD SUGGESTED BY THE GROUP THAT MIGHT REQUIRE CHANGE IN EDUCATION*

The Knowledge Explosion
The Job Market
Fixation on Money
Dependence on Money
Materialism
Futurism
The Counter Culture
Racial Problems
Bureaucracy
The Technological Revolution
Environmental Deterioration
Psycho-physical Deterioration
Increasing Social Problems
    (crime, delinquency, drugs, etc.)

COMMENT:

All of these things seem to have been around for a long time, obviously; is it that we're just beginning to realize it on a large scale?

WIGHT:

Yes. And we could go on, but this gives us a pretty good picture. I believe people in general are beginning to realize that schools are not preparing people to live in this kind of world, to cope with the rapid change and the turmoil, and to solve the kinds of problems we see in this list.

---

* To conserve space, only the list, not the accompanying discussion, will be included here.

What we'd like to do now is take a look at the characteristics of a person who can live and work effectively in this world.

COMMENT:

Skillful, powerful.

COMMENT:

Obsessive-compulsive neurotics.

WIGHT:

You want me to write that?

COMMENT:

I think that everybody who is going to grapple with these things has to be sort of nuts.

WIGHT:

You may be right, but let's look at the ideal, the kind of person who has both the coping and problem-solving skills to make this a better world. Let's brainstorm in this direction.

Table 2

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EFFECTIVE PERSON*

Adaptable (but within reason, not a person who will tolerate anything)
Constructive Discontent
In Contact with His Environment
Dreamer
Facilitator
Capacity to Enter Into and Complete Intimate Relationships
Effective Interpersonally

---

* To conserve space, the discussion accompanying the list is not included.

Aware
Persistent (Perseverance)
Enlightened
Fearless, Courageous
Role Adaptability
Good Learner
Good Listener
Able to Affect Others, Dynamic
Secure
Open to People
Open to Ideas
Sensually Alive
Able to Maintain Historical Perspective

WIGHT:

O.K. that's a good start. Now let's describe the person who would be ineffective—what characteristics do you feel would be dysfunctional or not effective in this kind of world?

Table 3

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INEFFECTIVE PERSON*

The Inverse of All Those in the Other List
Archie Bunkerism
    (bigotry, narrow-mindedness)
Exclusively Future- or Past-oriented
Technological Romanticist
    (back to the good old days)
An "ist" of Any Kind
Strung Out on Drugs
Strung Out on Anything

WIGHT:

I think with a little time any of us could add much more to these lists. Now, looking at the positive characteristics first, how many of these are being developed in our present school systems? I'm talking about school systems all the way from kindergarten through graduate schools in the university.

---

* To conserve space, the discussion accompanying the list is not included.

COMMENT:

Constructive discontent is an unintentional consequence . . .

COMMENT:

Discontent with instruction, in the large majority of cases, is destructive, not constructive.

COMMENT:

Persistence. Without persistence you don't get a Ph.D.

WIGHT:

O.K. So we have persistence but misdirected persistence.

COMMENT:

Or outer-directed persistence. I mean you're doing what you're told to do.

COMMENT:

How about security?

COMMENT:

No! I think it's paranoia rather than security. Just fear of an alternative.

COMMENT:

Dreaming—escapism (or something like that).

COMMENT:

Oh, I don't know. I'm so down on traditional schools, I wouldn't give them credit for any of those things.

COMMENT:

We're giving them credit the back-handed way.

COMMENT:

That's it. It's more in spite of than because of.

COMMENT:

We're talking about ourselves when we talk about this, you know.

COMMENT:

I'm waiting for you to drop the other shoe and say that participative education is the answer.

WIGHT:

No, I won't say that participative education is the only answer. But I think I'm picking up general agreement that we have far too many of the negative characteristics coming out of the present system and not nearly enough of the positive outcomes, which means that we need a change, and that's why we're all here. If we are ready to move on, what kind of school or system would give us the outcomes we want—the positive outcomes and not the negative?

COMMENT:

How about one that's totally void of structure?

COMMENT:

Do you think that would do it? Would that do it?

COMMENT:

I just said, "How about . . .?" O.K.?

ROGER BATY (Johnston College):

One-to-one encounter.

COMMENT:

"Now" oriented.

COMMENT:

I would change that to realistically future-oriented. Thinking fifteen years ahead of yourself, and non-forced education.

COMMENT:

I'm puzzled about one thing. I really am puzzled! Would we want an enterprise in which our graduates would have the notion that 7 x 6 is 43? Do we care about anything in that realm?

COMMENT:

I think we do. 7 x 6 is 42! You mean: Can they apply logic, or some system that has value to them?

COMMENT:

No. Like, does it matter where the sun is right this minute?

COMMENT:

I think it really does have something to do with process, you know, when somebody says "7 x 6 is 43"; what do you do next? You're going around with a pretty loose model.

COMMENT:

It seems to me, though, that that wouldn't exist today regardless of the approach you took. Seems like we've missed the whole human level—how do we get along? Who are we?—versus the amount of data our minds can consume.

WIGHT:

If I hear you correctly, I think I would agree, in that if we're talking realistically about the now or the future, we're talking about responding to needs, present and future. If we feel that

"7 x 6 is 42" is a need I think it would be included. It would be something we would learn.

VIC BALDRIDGE (Stanford University):

What are you going to do with Freud, Marx, and Aristotle? I'm impatient now. This has been a very valuable experience so far and I hope we don't stay on this level. I hope we don't keep bullshitting. We all think we fundamentally agree on the big values. Can we get down to what we can take back with us that's going to be useful in translating these into action?

LARRY MAGID (Center for Educational Reform):

I'm not sure we agree on values. I disagree with a lot of the values that are expressed in this room.

BALDRIDGE:

I'm sorry but I'm in the process of doing a very experimental thing and I'm interested in what people can give to me to take home with me.

MAGID:

I really have to object because I'm tired of coming to national conferences and listening to people show and tell what they're doing and there's like three and a half days to this and it happens to be the first useful ideological discussion I've seen in twenty national educational conferences I've been to. I would feel cheated if it were disrupted so we could get into a specific orientation on how to perpetuate the same rotten experimental education system we've had for the last seven years.

DOXSEY:

I just heard Larry say he didn't accept some of the values being perpetuated . . .

MAGID:

I'm amazed at that list. This is a roomful of people who, like myself, are essentially middle class, white American—if you were to ask, say, 80 per cent of the world population to list their priorities, it wouldn't look anything like that. And as long as we happen to control 80 per cent of the world's wealth, as a nation we have to discuss their priorities also. I'm really kind of disappointed . . .

COMMENT:

That's not a list of priorities though.

MAGID:

Well, it is. We didn't mention such things as economic exploitation of the third world, malnutrition, sexism—I don't want to extend the list—I just want to point out the priorities that we in the experimental education movement are revealing, and I'd like to question the values that are implicit behind experimental education and suggest that maybe we're not going in the right direction at all. Maybe we should put the brakes on, not in terms of structure but in terms of values. I just want to point out that I don't share all these values. If you want to talk about values, this is the time to do it rather than more tactics to continue the same kind of nonsense we've been doing for the last seven years.

PAUL CORNEIL (Johnston College):

I want you to keep going. I want to hear you talk more about the way you think education should be addressing your values.

MAGID:

Well, essentially, one of the problems in American society seems to be that we are taught to think individualistically. The only time we think collectively is when it involves a very small universe—usually the nuclear family. You know, father, mother, three kids. And even in that nuclear family we're taught competition; we're taught essentially deceit within the family. Our entire society is, I think, based overwhelmingly on individualism. I think it is prominently displayed right now in the kind of primitive movement that's developing and in the counter-culture being essentially a lot of strung out people concerned with very individualistically oriented values, so much so that the concept of brotherhood and sisterhood is lost to our generation. Long hair was once a symbol of emerging thought; it now means a typical American person. And this is so, I think, with a great deal of experimental education programs. If we're talking about changing society through education, we need to start talking about changing the politics and values in which education is based. That brings you down to a number of basic variables such as the concept of collective behavior and the concept of political education. Most experimental education has no political education. It has no historical perspective. Most of us have a totally incorrect impression about what has happened in the last 5,000 years. We have a westernized version of it and more than westernized—we have an American ruling class version of it. We aren't even aware of the radicalism in the United States. Most of us aren't aware of campus movements, that in 1903 there was a shootout in Alabama over an ROTC issue. I mean, there are all sorts of things we have to talk about . . . .

BATY:

Could you sum that up and start working on the task of describing the kind of education that you see producing people with the kind of values that you're interested in? Or the kind of education that's congruent with the values that you're talking about?

COMMENT:

I see someone impatiently waiting with his hand up.

COMMENT:

Yeah, I'm feeling very cheated—because I understood this to be a technique to get us into the issues listed on the board, and we haven't mentioned a thing about those issues. I don't think we can solve the big questions in here.

WIGHT:

I don't see any conflict between the two. I think that what Larry is talking about is an expansion of what we started to list as needed outcomes of education, getting into the problems of the third world, poverty, inequity, etc. And he's asking some pertinent questions regarding the relevance of most experimental education. But I don't think we have to be unanimous in deciding what the problems are, if we have a problem-oriented educational system which allows us to identify problems and explore various solutions.

MAGID:

Do you think that these are the questions that blacks and Chicanos are raising?

WIGHT:

Yes—in my experience with blacks and Chicanos.

BATY:

I now live in a world where this is the first meeting that I've been in like this for weeks and weeks and weeks. When I'm in a meeting with middle class white liberals, I'm suspicious. And when there are just two black women at the conference, I vote for Larry.

COMMENT:

Yeah, what is your world now?

BATY:

It's a world in which I have been cut down to size, primarily by Chicanos and blacks, in part by radical whites. I think that this list in some ways is simply by-product issues associated with the cultural oppression, and if you're talking about education and poor people who are oppressed, you get into a different way of looking at the problem.

COMMENT:

I think I see that a distinction has to made between isolation and individualism, because what I see being procreated in my surroundings today is isolation and fear, which is at the base of separation. But what I see somewhat at the base of experimental education systems is individualism—without that fear of being with other people. So I don't think that it's particularly participative education and systems like it that's procreating what I see as sort of a sick isolation—people's removal from each other out of lack of interest, lack of concern, and fear of what that other person might impose on him.

WIGHT:

Let me comment just briefly. I would like to make one distinction I think is very important. There's a lot of innovation within the traditional model that I don't feel is helping to solve these problems, but I think you can have innovation within other models. Innovation within participative education, I think, is much more exploratory, much more problem-solving oriented, much more open to delving into problems and facing them realistically, and it deals with the problem of focusing on individual growth and development within society, with an orientation toward living and working effectively with other people. In my opinion, which admittedly is biased, it has been more effective than any other model I have seen in helping persons from different cultures and races learn to live and work effectively together.

COMMENT:

I appreciate your comment on that, but is the force of your comment partly that participative education, as we practice it, is sort of an elitist little gang—we all get off in the corner and do our thing—with little or no effect on the rest of the world? Because if that's the case, I agree with you.

MAGID:

Let me add to that. I was running a program at Berkeley which we called the Center for Participant Education and we had a concept which differed from what you'd normally call an experimental college—which is the reason I came to this workshop—I wanted to see if there was anything common in that word. Experimental education, which I think is a mind-set that we're all coming out of, is in a sense, an opportunity to sit around, take all people who normally might have some possibility of changing things, put them in an environment where they have very little impact on society, and where society has little impact on them. Essentially, isolate them into these bourgeois ghettos where they can do a little kind of self-masturbation and then send them out four years later in the hopes that they'll get some kind of a job in a corporation where they can continue the same process, you know, *ad infinitim*. That's what I look at most experimental education as being, over the last few years. I think it's no wonder that suddenly large financial interests are concerned with experimental education. I think one can define a type of political education or participative education or goal-oriented radical educational alternatives which would do as Al suggests, and in addition to that, help develop an ideology and change process which is very much missing in the present educational experiments that I know of. I think the educational experiments have been one of the most effective means of counter insurgency on the campuses that I have seen, and I feel very good about this. I was involved in this process at its beginning in California about five or six years ago, where I saw what began as potentially a revolutionary force turn into a force of counter-revolution because of this ideology of experimentation, and process and growth, and encounter. And I am amazed just as the gentlemen over here, because in the world that I'm normally in, even if there are no Chicanos and blacks, there are usually white people who have become sensitized to the needs of Chicanos and blacks, women, Asians, essentially most of the peoples of the world, and that should be kind of one of the main goals. And I think that we need to have Chicanos and blacks who want to be included, because of all the revolutions that have taken place in the last . . .

BALDRIDGE:

Just a minute, you're really running off in a bullshit . . . Yes, you are.

MAGID:

No, I'm not . . . let me finish . . .

BALDRIDGE:

Why don't you start talking? What you're saying essentially is that this list is sort of the same old bullshit that has come out of experimental education in the last seven years, and there is something else—there should be another list we should be arriving at—describing the kinds of approaches which should be used to get at the way of educating people—working with the people that you're trying to talk about. Now, I'd like you to cut off surmising—which is seven years old—everybody here has heard it; and get down to brass tacks.

COMMENT:

May I come to your defense? I think I finally understood what you said. I really now have come full circle. I think you're talking about something that's really critical to the heart of participative education. Because, what do we do with it? It's a tool. How do we use it? And if one of the things we're using it for is to avoid real problems and retreat into little shells, do our little stroking process, and let the rest of the world go to hell, then we are badly misusing it. You're asking a bigger question: How do we use this tool and what do we use it for? And in that sense, I finally understood what you're getting at. I think you're right on.

MAGID:

Let me make one last point which is that we, as middle class Americans, have a rare gift, which no other class of people has, which is that of all people who have a certain degree of enlightenment, and the ability to challenge established order, we have the most access to that order at the same time. More so than our black or Chicano brothers and sisters or whatever. We're the ones who hold the potential power and the influence over the heart of the Empire. That's what I wanted to finish with: that we have the greatest responsibility and opportunity to deal with these problems.

COMMENT:

Wow, that's really paternalistic . . .

MAGID:

No, it isn't paternalistic! The Chinese aren't going to come and take over Washington. We've got to do it, if it's going to happen. Not that we're going to ultimately do it for the blacks and browns. But we're the ones that are closest to the heart of the problem and if it's going to happen—unless there's going to be a violent revolution—we have to make it happen.

BALDRIDGE:

This year we incorporated a bunch of blacks into a planning staff and said, "How can we shape this whole experimental thing?" They said, "O.K., if you really want to do it, use your experimental approach as a tool to study power and its distribution in the society and how the blacks, or the browns, or women are getting screwed over." And we completely reversed—we put some content into the thing. Instead of self-stroking, we put in sociological content, and we started talking about those kinds of issues using the experimental model as a tool. So I think maybe they can be linked—the kinds of goals you want to achieve and the experimental model.

COMMENT:

Al, can you plug participative education into this?

WIGHT:

The points Vic is making are very important, I think. In a lot of experimental education we deal only with process. We sit around and groove on what is happening to us as we begin to relate to other people in a meaningful way. I'm not saying there is anything wrong with this, but what Vic is saying, and I agree, is that there is a lot more. You can introduce nearly any content into the participative, experimental process and make the whole experience much more relevant. This is a much more powerful educational tool than the traditional information transmission model. You have more intense involvement, people thinking for themselves, identifying and solving problems, sharing ideas, and becoming committed to the goals they're working toward.

COMMENT:

Could I ask a question? In terms of our situation at Johnston, I think we share your concerns, but the very practical nuts and bolts of this for us is, that the kind of education, the kind of person that we're trying to produce, or at least the direction in which we are moving is definitely contradictory to the environment which we are in at the University of Redlands. So in a sense we have to be covert—right? I guess all education, if it's going to move in this direction, for a time will have to live on an acid line, in order to survive. I would just like to hear you respond.

COMMENT:

My response is that that's the first really pertinent thing I've heard since I walked into this room. And I'm glad that we're starting to talk about what we're doing rather than nebulous abstractions.

COMMENT:

What she's saying is now that we have talked about the big issues, (at first I didn't think all this made sense but now I do); now that we've got it tied down, let's get down to brass tacks and concrete ideas.

COMMENT:

Let me ask you this. In an institution which has to charge

$2,300 tuition to survive, how can you get a propensity of blacks and Chicanos with no scholarship aid?

COMMENT:

That's another issue. How can we get blacks and Chicanos? Most of the blacks and Chicanos have left Johnston College because it's a middle class experimental institution. How do we become aware of their needs too, and develop an opening into their worlds?

COMMENT:

Blacks and Chicanos here at Johnston College must have the money; they must be middle class. What kinds of things cause them to leave?

BATY:

Well, I remember one thing. We put them into T groups; the blacks said, "So what's new?" And the Chicanos said, "You're not going to touch my machismo." And it's a nice white middle class operation. But I think we could go on for a long time talking about the problems of the people we know very little about—that's the blacks and browns and the rest of the world. It seems to me that if we want to know about the blacks and the browns, one element of the education we ought to get is some kind of exposure that's going to turn our heads around. I'm wondering how an educational system can be designed to build in these kinds of opportunities.

COMMENT:

I think it's been said: It's essentially social-political awareness.

BATY:

That doesn't say anything to me at all. I don't know how to implement social and political awareness.

COMMENT:

It's easy, easy, man. Talk about what we're talking about right now with the people who are existing in it. Make it part of your course structure, in other words. Involve them as teachers. Have them teach for a while. You can learn from anyone; that's what I'm trying to say.

FRAN MACY (Central New York Consortium for the External Degree):

Al, one thing that's been on my mind in this room, and for the past years I've been in the Peace Corps, is: It's a real question as to whether the participative method, as I understand it, is appropriate for all kinds of clients. And in talking about blacks and Chicanos, there's no involvement here of blacks and Chicanos, with those motives, those ends, those goals we have been discussing—at least initial goals. O.K., is the method appropriate? It seems to me that to talk about an optimum method of learning, of education—I hate to say it—is missing the boat a little bit. Maybe we ought to be a little bit more specific and ask experimental colleges who their clients are. My perception is that their clients are a very distinct sub-culture of what might be called middle class who find it very difficult to learn under traditional kinds of operations. O.K.? And the design of alternatives provides space for that sub-culture to get it on.

WIGHT:

I don't agree that it is something that has been developed and works only with the white sub-culture of middle class America. We have worked with persons from many different cultures in the Peace Corps, as you know. We have worked with institutionalized delinquents who couldn't make it in the traditional systems. We have worked with Job Corps kids who were predominantly blacks and who were for the most part dropouts. And they responded better to participative education than any white middle class students that I have ever seen. They really get into it, perhaps because it's a much more personal, human kind of educational system with a lot more personal involvement and interaction. It focuses much more on the needs of the individual, in a non-competitive, cooperative and supportive atmosphere, and these people respond to it; they respond to it beautifully.

COMMENT:

Aren't you saying the same thing?

MACY:

Yeah, but his category is much broader.

COMMENT:

I think I can accept that. The key word is dropout. In the school I worked with, they were all dropouts. If we hadn't had that program, they wouldn't have been in school. You know, like there are people twenty-eight and thirty who are wandering around who haven't found anything and they wouldn't be there.

COMMENT:

Yeah, I wouldn't say that we should go all out on traditional education and replace it with participative education. But I say, it is another model of education that I woudn't hesitate to bring in and put right along side traditional education any place for anybody. Let them make their choice, you know . . .

WIGHT:

But I am saying something different. I wouldn't want people to infer that participative education (or some other model of experimental education) is an alternative we should resort to when the traditional model fails. I am saying that it is more effective than the traditional model, not only in the achievement of humanistic objectives, but for the learning of content as well. And it works with students who can succeed in and tolerate the traditional model, not just with the dropout. Some students have problems with it, granted, but a certain percentage of any group will resist change. Some students don't want change because their primary objective is to continue beating the system until they can get the hell out of it. They are so down on education that nothing labeled as education would be attractive to them. Some are high achievers who enjoy the feeling of superiority this gives them. Others are insecure and lacking in self-confidence. They have conformed and learned to be dependent on the system. They become extremely anxious, and sometimes hostile when this crutch is taken away and they have to start thinking for themselves.

COMMENT:

What do you mean by participative education?

COMMENT:

We never defined it.

COMMENT:

What you might want to propose as alternatives to traditional education I might not want because I don't know what we're talking about yet.

COMMENT:

I'm just saying that I appreciate what's going on.

BALDRIDGE:

I feel like we're stroking. We're saying the same thing over and over and over and over again. And I still don't have a single idea I can take back to Stanford and use.

CORNEIL:

I'd like to ask a favor . . . What's been the most exciting for me in this room since we've been going, is whenever you all are talking about the things you're doing in connection with the ideological issues we've been discussing—so I'd like to know what each program is: your program that has the dropouts in it; what you're doing now and what you did at Berkeley; I'd like to know what you're into.

MARK COLLIN (Sonoma State College):

Well, we're in a little school of 120 people and six or seven faculty, called the School of Expressive Arts. It's all white, and it's all people who have been very discontent—not really finding any meaning in education. There is very little structure—there are no grades, no classes, and no schedule. What it is, is pretty much trying to create a community where each person can find out kind of where he is and feed and grow off each other.

COMMENT:

What are you learning?

COLLIN:

There are 120 people with 120 different ways of doing it. What we're learning that's most important to us right now, is the school gives us space so we can do whatever we want to do. If it's nothing, then it's nothing. And if we don't do anything for a year, then we talk about that. Which is really nice; like you can fail; you can do nothing. The general consensus is, well, can you talk about it though? Can you say where nothing was? Or can you say how you feel after this?

COMMENT:

How long have you been in existence?

COLLIN:

This is our second year.

COMMENT:

Find any difference between the first and second year?

COLLIN:

Very much so, yeah. You mean as far as my growth? I wouldn't trade it for anything! I've got so much more meaning, so much more life, so much more positive things about life because I'm doing it. I've realized that it's me that's really making all the decisions; it's me that has to make a meaningful place for myself and the only way I can do it is to go out and do it. And slowly I've been able to do it. I've flipped and flopped for a year and a half but there are people I can bounce off to and say, "I'm really feeling crazy," because the whole structure is all left up to you to structure yourself, to find out where you are in relationship to all this and try to do something with it.

COMMENT:

What differences do you see between the first and second year?

COLLIN:

In the school itself? In the first class it was pretty much rapping about what we weren't doing—trying to define ourselves, trying to find what we are—what the School of Expressive Arts was. A lot of people were very anxious and frustrated for the year. We did a lot of talking in the way our structure was set up. Once a week we met as a unit, 120 people, and we would break out in small groups. The second year the new group came in, and we were still not tuned in to ourselves, so we could see from the first group that we were . . . . Terry you've got to help me with this.

TERRY CADIGAN (Sonoma State College):

Perhaps you ought to explain more about the process, what we have actualized, as individuals, working in the communities around us. We have people working with mentally retarded kids. Mark and I worked with juvenile delinquent dropouts in high school. We're creating a new educational pilot program within the system. We do work, you know; it's not like we space out and groove on ourselves type of thing. At first, we are spaced out and we try to identify the reasons we are. But when we start getting things together, we go out and help other people realize themselves. In other words, all we want is for people to center, and if people center they do become human, and I disagree with you about becoming individuals. You say if you are an individual—humanistic individual—you don't care about other people and you don't work with groups. We do work with groups. Being human is wanting other people.

COMMENT:

Could you explain something more about these once weekly meetings—the organized agenda? Is there somebody in charge of it?

COLLIN:

No, there's no topic; nothing is set up. We have Wednesdays from 2:00 to 5:00 set up for assembly where we get together and anything could happen. Sometimes nothing happens. Sometimes it's mainly for people to share on a general scale what they're doing and the kinds of things they're into; to get acknowledgements for some of the projects that they're doing . . . . And sometimes people take on a different role as leader. Sometimes people show their movies that they've made; live shows; workshops they've created; some poetry they've written; just the fact of getting in front of 130 people and sharing their secrets is a pretty heavy thing.

COMMENT:

What are the hassles?

COLLIN:

The hassles are pretty much individual, I think. They're pretty much working with your stuff, you know, having the freedom to say what you want to do and do it.

COMMENT:

Could you tell us what you are doing at Stanford?

BALDRIDGE:

Actually this is a teacher training program, and a very different kind of animal from the one we were just talking about. When

I flew off at Larry a moment ago, I thought he was bullshitting, but I finally got to the point and it was the same point that was made to us forcefully the year before; which was essentially that we were doing this for a self-stroking, do your own thing, enjoy yourself, be creative routine and the whole world about you is going to hell, and we weren't doing a damn thing about it. So we then shifted the whole goal concept. We started to look at power, conflict, and exploitation in the school system. This became our whole goal and the techniques we used became the means for achieving that end. And this end is extremely important to us. It isn't that we're just going through some exercises looking for ourselves. We're really going into an external exercise of saying, "What can we do to change society?" because the participative education thing became a technique for achieving this.

I'm a student of Al's although we never met each other until last night because he trained some Peace Corps people who then trained me. We decided we wanted a mix of experiences in our training program. We didn't want essentially sensitivity training or simply simulation games. We did not want internships alone, but rather some rich mix of all those things. We wanted to implement the philosophy of shared education, shared decision making with the students; a staff that considers itself co-learners in a participative learning experience. Simulation and simulation games became a very critical part of this. We set aside large blocks of time during the training program to carry out simulation games.

Another thing was the field experiences. I should have first mentioned the experience team. We divided the training group into teams of five or six people each and these teams became self-analytical groups in a sense that they observed their own behavior. They were constantly focussing on their own group dynamics. We ran weekend retreats to build solidarity and let them find their own way of organizing their groups. They formed their own teams; we didn't form them for them—and only at the end of a long experiential series of sessions in which they came to know themselves. These experience teams, then, are the action units which work together in the training programs, the simulation games, and field training. We don't hesitate to incorporate readings, lectures, and what would be called traditional modes of education; because, within this context they all become new. They're not just the same old drag. Students come to us and say, "Would you please give us a lecture? Would you please stand up and tell us what you know about group dynamics? We've been doing all these simulations and group dynamics and self-analysis and we know you know something. Would you tell us what you know and we'll tell you what we think about it. We'll interact with you." We don't hesitate to pour on readings, sociological resources, the whole bit, and really demand that they read it with no apologies asked. So we have the readings, lectures, simulations, experience teams, field experience and all in a real dynamic mix. It's not *one* of those things; it's *all* of those things, all at the same time, plus the philosophical assumption about co-learners and all that sort of thing. But everything is directed toward that kind of goal.

COMMENT:

Is there 100 per cent participation—everybody getting along—and is everybody doing it? Do you have a structure and the people who want to go along with it . . .?

BALDRIDGE:

It's clearly structured—we're not an unstructured group. We never pretend to be; we don't apologize for having structure. We have very, very clear structure but they participate in building the structure, you know, and we share the decision making procedures to change the structure frequently. We don't ever intend to be an unstructured group.

COMMENT:

How many people are in this program?

BALDRIDGE:

Sixty.

COMMENT:

Are the people committed to only this program or do they have other commitments?

BALDRIDGE:

They have other commitments. If we had a captive group like the Peace Corps people, the impact would undoubtedly be greater.

COMMENT:

Do you have difficulty in carving out blocks of time?

BALDRIDGE:

No, we announce that we want large blocks of time and we set them up and say, "If you can't come at those times, we would like to serve you but we can't."

COMMENT:

What's your relationship to the university structure, whether it be the education department or whatever else?

BALDRIDGE:

I'm a professor in the sociology department and the school of education—joint appointment—and the program is a regularized feature within the school of education.

COMMENT:

Is this a particular program of the school?

BALDRIDGE:

It's an on-going program.

COMMENT:

What's the name of the program?

BALDRIDGE:

Well, it's called the STET program—Stanford Teacher Education Training Program.

COMMENT:

Do you get three units for that or does it consume like ten units or . . . .

BALDRIDGE:

No, this is a seven unit affair, which is a double course load, like two courses.

COMMENT:

Seems like it could be a whole year . . . .

BALDRIDGE:

Of course. I wish I could have it all the time. I could have real input. As it is, it's real impact—but for two quarters . . . .

COMMENT:

So your students must go through all these steps that you set up for them?

BALDRIDGE:

That came across as a criticism. But we don't apologize for the structure—we believe that a certain amount of structure is very facilitative to the kinds of experiences we want.

COMMENT:

I think it's great teacher training but I don't see that it's so much different from a regular classroom.

BALDRIDGE:

They have those goals I mentioned earlier.

COMMENT:

Yes, those goals are different. Addressing those problems is crucial, because no matter what your experience is, it seems to me, in alternative education, if you get out and get into one of the school systems, you've had it.

WIGHT:

I don't see the goals as the only difference. Another critical difference is the shared decision making, students helping to develop the structure . . . .

COMMENT:

I understand that they're enjoying the learning experience, too.

WIGHT:

Right. The participative model lends itself to all kinds of goals. We have used it with engineering students, with purely engineering goals and objectives dealing with the kinds of problems they actually will encounter as engineers.

COMMENT:

I think it's great. Your program is designed for people who want to be teachers—that's their goal plus they're learning about power, conflict, and exploitation. The kind of program that I've experienced is offered to help a person discover what he wants to do with his life.

COMMENT:

Al, I get the feeling that a lot of what we're talking about in participative education is like talking about motherhood because I can't see much else but consensus about the virtues of a thing like this in contrast with traditional education and what I'd like to hear is something more specific about the methodology . . . .

COMMENT:

I have a question. What are you going to do with questions of tenure and promotion?

WIGHT:

There are lots more questions than that . . . . What about evaluation? What are you going to do with grades? Degrees? The length of a course? There are all kinds of questions.

COMMENT:

The whole question of how curricular decision making takes place . . . .

COMMENT:

Seems like we're all asking the same kinds of questions. Maybe if Al, keeping in mind that most of us have read this handout, would take five or ten minutes or whatever—to say something more concrete about the methodology, rather than continue the discussion?

WIGHT:

O.K., but let's keep it open for questions or comments. We make the assumption that learning is more likely to take place when the learner's needs are being met. If this assumption is made in the traditional classroom, it seldom is evident. The student is usually required to conform to the course objectives, content, and activities, whether he finds them meaningful or not. In participative education, the orientation is toward building on what is of interest or concern to the student and toward helping the student broaden and clarify his interests and concerns. If the student can articulate goals, we should get out of his way and allow him to begin working toward their achievement, providing whatever assistance and support we can. If his goals are vague or need clarification, as they quite likely will be at first, the emphasis should be on providing experience to help him sharpen his goals. Let me put something on the board to illustrate some of the key differences between participative and traditional education:

Traditional Education	**Participative Education**
1. Instructor decides on objectives, which may or may not be communicated to the students.	1. Students and instructor together identify needs and define objectives.
2. Information is transmitted to the students (through lectures and reading assignments).	2. Students or instructor identify significant experience or problems which will help students broaden understanding and clarify goals.
3. Instructor might provide examples of application for clarification.	3. Students identify and make use of resources (with instructor's help and guidance) to obtain information they need to achieve goals or solve problems.
4. Instructor might assign exercises or problems to provide practice applying information.	4. Students and instructor explore and evaluate various solutions.
5. Instructor tests students for knowledge and understanding.	5. Students and instructor assess progress, identify additional learning needs, and redefine objectives.
6. Instructor evaluates students' performance and assigns grades.	

This does not mean that the instructor can't do anything without the students. We feel he should develop a comprehensive set of provisional objectives, identify problems, develop simulations or situational exercises, identify resources, etc., before the students arrive, with the expectation that many changes might be made as a result of student involvement and interaction. This would be more difficult, of course, if the student's primary need and goal is to find himself, as opposed to, let's say, to learn something about circuits in preparation for a career as an electrical engineer. But there are a great many very effective exercises and experiences that would probably be meaningful to a student who was trying to find himself, and a lot of good books that could be used as resources.

COMMENT:

If your student understands that he needs to know something about circuits, then what's wrong with the traditional model?

WIGHT:

Many things. In the first place, the information you transmit to the student may mean very little to him because he has not had the experience to comprehend it. When he has identified a specific need, because of a defined void in his understanding, or to solve a particular problem, and he is seeking the information himself, it takes on meaning.

COMMENT:

This all sounds pretty mechanistic. Maybe because I'm in the natural sciences, I find the social science methodology kind of annoying. What that says is that something happens in my classroom between me and my students that's analyzable in terms of some key words. What that misses, I think, is that most of the work I do is therapeutic. O.K.? I spend an awful lot of time getting into my students' heads and letting them into mine. Also, it seems to me (I could be wrong—but you have to give me some data to prove it) that if a student has found a problem he wants to solve, he can solve it with or wihout a goddamn facilitator. He's going to go on his own, painfully, and in the process some real learning will take place. My sense is that better things will happen to a student if you let him make those mistakes and get to point X, which was where we thought he ought to get in the first place, except that he could have gotten there three years sooner.

WIGHT:

This model does not preclude what you're saying. It includes it. But if I'm an instructor, maybe I've had some experience that will allow me to serve as a resource to you. Maybe I can help identify other resources that would take you years to locate. With the experience and the knowledge that I have, I might be able to speed this process up for you, without interfering with the learning process.

COMMENT:

What if the student doesn't use you?

WIGHT:

He doesn't have to. Ultimately we have to get down to the question of evaluation, however—the whole question of accountability. How much did he learn, what didn't he learn, how qualified is he, what are the requirements that he will have to meet? These have to be faced somewhere.

COMMENT:

But his accountability is his! Not yours!

WIGHT:

If I'm hiring the guy, the accountability isn't just his—just to himself. Or if I'm a citizen of the community where he's going to be serving, his accountability isn't just to himself. I feel it is a part of my responsibility as a teacher to confront the student with reality. What are the requirements of the field he is preparing for? What will be expected or demanded of him? How well is he performing with respect to these requirements?

COMMENT:

Yeah, but suppose I come to you and say I want to learn to play the harpsichord, and it turns out that I'm tone deaf and I have lousy reflexes. But at the end of twelve months I have achieved several objectives that I had set out to achieve and I enjoy playing that crazy instrument. Now what do you do with that?

WIGHT:

I don't have any problems with that. Unless you want to hire yourself out as a harpsichord player somewhere.

COMMENT:

The goals, I think, determine your evaluation. You can use a competitive evaluation or use a self, non-competitive evaluation, depending on what you're going to do. If it's for your own fulfillment, there should be self-evaluation. On the other hand, if you're in an engineering program, it's oriented toward the job market —you really can't get away from non-competitive situations or competitive evaluation situations.

WIGHT:

I think you can. If the people who are going to be placing the requirements on you can spell out what it is you have to be able to do, then you can measure performance in relation to the requirements of that particular job, rather than in relation to the performance of others in the course.

COMMENT:

Yeah, but ultimately they're going to pick the one who most nearly fulfills their requirements.

WIGHT:

O.K., but the traditional letter grade based on comparison with other students doesn't tell the prospective employer how well you are prepared for the job. And with non-competitive evaluation, your objective is to master the subject matter, not to get higher grades than the other students.

COMMENT:

If universities say their primary clients are the students, then there is no justification in my mind that undergraduate education can in any shape or form be regarded as a vocational trip. And if it can't be regarded as a vocational trip, then the whole question of goal structuring, organizing learning, really has to deal with where the student is as a person all along the way. Then when you get to evaluation, it seems to be unconscionable that evaluation can be performed on that student by an external source. It's all right if you can say it's a vocational trip or General Electric or graduate school or what have you because that's consistent.

COMMENT:

Why can't you have both? If a student is career-minded and wants vocational training, O.K., and let's multiply options, but don't lay that trip on a student who isn't.

WIGHT:

I think it depends on the purpose of the evaluation. If it is to assign a grade, then I don't see any justification for it in either case. If it is to provide feedback to the student in his own learning program, and is information he wants for his self-evaluation, it can be very useful. This is sometimes difficult to accept, however, because of the negative experience we have all had with evaluation.

HAROLD HODGKINSON:

Students are hopelessly naive about the whole question of self-evaluation, and the institution is of no help. I don't think that either Johnston or even Santa Cruz, as a whole, really helps students to do that job better.

COMMENT:

Yeah, I can see this, but it seems to me that if they start telling us how to evaluate; if they give us criteria we should use to evaluate ourselves, then it seems to me they're also putting in there what we should be.

HODGKINSON:

That's not what I had in mind.

COMMENT:

I suspect the main reason these people aren't able to help the students is because it's a kind of evaluation that's totally foreign to most faculty.

HODGKINSON:

Not only foreign, but ego-upsetting. What Iowa has now done is to hire a psychiatrist who comes out and spends a day with the faculty. They have to go through this themselves before they can expect students to do a better job at it. The first month was really very uncomfortable, but the second month people started to come around. Now they have a tremendous thing going, in terms of getting the faculty more aware of their own evaluative devices. And once a faculty member has to go through the complex process, boy, does he change his mind about what he expects of his students. Just as the examined life is the only life worth living, the way in which you examine your life is the essence of the contract model. And if evaluation is imposed on you, by either a checklist or a committee, when they're supposed to be your colleagues and your peers, then it violates the whole experience. But this training process, and I don't mean training in the usual sense of the word—toward better self-evaluation—I think is something that I never heard talked about much at Johnston or Santa Cruz.

COMMENT:

You're working with Empire State and they have the University Without Walls. They're versatile and from what I've been hearing here, they can operate with a kind of continuing relationship without any kind of deadline dates—there's no such thing as a semester—there is no starting time; no ending time until you decide it's ended. And it seems to me the face-to-face kind of facilitating and so forth that you do with your students permits a training in self-evaluation, if the facilitator is able and conscious of doing that sort of thing. What are they finding out with the program they're starting at Empire State—are they conscious of this kind of problem?

HODGKINSON:

This is the kind of skill that they are looking at very self-consciously. They want to know what mentorship means and they're interested in knowing how long it takes to write a good contract, and once the contract is written, what are the evaluation sequences that seem to make sense?

COMMENT:

It seems to me that this has fantastic relevance for state colleges.

COMMENT:

Yeah, but how do you put this into an institution of 18,000?

COMMENT:

Wouldn't this require a major change in the general programs that most universities have?

WIGHT:

It would be a complete turn-around for most. The total experience of most instructors has been with norm referenced measurement, where it doesn't matter whether a test is relevant to the course or objectives, as long as it spreads the students out for easy grading. A score on the test doesn't tell you what the student knows, what he doesn't know, or what he needs in relation to the objectives. This calls for objectives-referenced or criterion-referenced measurement, which is beyond the experience of most instructors.

COMMENT:

What do you do about accreditation?

COMMENT:

Wisconsin lost their teacher accreditation—School of Education—eight years ago. Everybody thought: Aha, that's the end of Wisconsin! But they kept on turning out teachers, and superintendents kept hiring them. I don't think they ever got it back, as far as I know.

COMMENT:

So there are exceptions.

COMMENT:

The problem comes in when you try to transfer from a non-accredited school to an accredited school. That's where the rub comes.

COMMENT:

That depends on the school.

COMMENT:

Oh, yeah, I'm not sure but I don't know how Johnston handles it. Does anyone here represent a non-accredited school?

COMMENT:

I do—Roger Williams College—it's non-accredited. It just started. We utilize the Union degree, which again is non-accredited.

COMMENT:

I have nothing to say on that score but I know for a fact, from a lot of careful research and exploration myself, that there is an increasing number of undergraduate institutions which are prepared to take students from non-accredited secondary schools —for example, free schools. This is very encouraging. And maybe that process is also happening with transfers from other universities.

WIGHT:

I feel experimental institutions need to take a stronger stand. I've noticed a general paranoia among university people here at this conference with respect to the need to prove the worth of their experimental programs to the larger university. Why should the burden of proof be on these programs? There is ample evidence that traditional education is not effective. The burden of proof should be on the traditionalist as well.

HODGKINSON:

I disagree. I think the burden of proof should be on the experimental programs.

WIGHT:

Then we disagree. The reason we have a big movement toward innovation is because of the failure of traditional education to meet society's needs. We need to take a new look at the purpose and objectives of education and challenge the traditional educators as well as those trying new approaches to demonstrate the effectiveness of their programs in meeting these objectives. I predict that traditional programs would not fare too well if a comparison were made against non-cognitive objectives, and we already have considerable evidence that one approach is no better than another if performance on traditional final examinations is the criterion. If we look back at the list of characteristics we felt were important as outcomes of education at the beginning of this session, we can see that these are almost entirely non-cognitive, and that very little is being done to produce them in our traditional classroom. If traditional education is not meeting the needs of today's world and the world of the future, it is time for change.

DOXSEY:

I personally do not believe that traditional education is capable of producing individuals with those characteristics. In our eight-state affective education project, we are constantly seeing the effects of the dehumanized and directive-authoritarian system. Apathy, discontent, and the total range of negative affective behaviors permeate even junior high schools and the lowest elementary grades. How student feelings and resentments eventually manifest themselves remains to be seen. I don't believe students are going to continue tolerating traditional education or that their reactions will be very constructive.

APPENDIX

PARTICIPATIVE VERSUS TRADITIONAL EDUCATION*

The fundamental difference between participative and traditional education is in the area of control and responsibility. In traditional education, the student has virtually no share in decisions regarding his education. In participative education, he shares the decision-making power as an equal partner with the teacher. In traditional education his responsibility is to do as he is told. In participative education he must assume the responsibility for his own learning.

In traditional education, the teacher's responsibility is to decide what the student needs to learn, to design and conduct an instructional program, and to evaluate the student's performance. In participative education, his responsibility is to involve the student as an active participant in the total process—identifying what needs to be learned, defining learning objectives, designing a learning program, identifying resources, and assessing progress. The student seeks information, solves problems, and evaluates both the information and the solutions. The teacher acts as coach, facilitator, and resource as needed throughout the entire process.

These two approaches to education are fundamentally different, and are based on opposing assumptions regarding human (student) nature and the nature of learning. The extremes of the two opposing philosophies are presented below:

---

* Handout given to participants to read before this session. For a more complete discussion, see A. R. Wight, "Participative Education and the Inevitable Revolution," *J. of Creative Behavior,* Vol. 4, No. 4, Fall, 1970, and A. R. Wight, "Additional Comments on Participative Education," *J. of Creative Behavior,* Vol. 5, No. 1, 1st Quarter, 1971.

Participative Education Assumes:	Traditional Education Assumes:
1. The student is a responsible person.	1. He is not.
2. The student is naturally interested in learning (if this interest is not stifled).	2. He is naturally lazy and not interested in learning.
3. The process of learning is more important than the content.	3. Content is more important than process.
4. The student will learn more (in terms of cognitive and particularly affective growth and development) if he is pursuing goals that are personally meaningful and relevant.	4. He will learn more in a program designed by someone who knows better than he what the goals should be. Affective goals are not the business of education.
5. Learning is more effective if it is based on experience (learning by doing).	5. The student's experience is usually irrelevant and inconsequential. He should learn from the experience of others.
6. Both affective and cognitive learning will be greater if the student assumes the responsibility for his own learning and is included as an active participant in the total process.	6. The teacher should be responsible. The student can not know enough to identify learning needs, set goals, design programs, and assess progress. Involving him in these activities is a waste of time. Learning will suffer.
7. Learning will be greater if the student seeks and discovers information he decides he needs to solve problems he confronts or answers questions he has raised.	7. Learning will be greater and more efficient if the teacher decides what facts are needed and transmits information through lectures and reading assignments.

8. Learning will be greater when self-evaluation is primary and evaluation by others is in support of self-evaluation.	8. The teacher should be the evaluator. The student does not know enough to evaluate his own performance and progress.
9. The student learns more when his ideas, opinions, suggestions, criticisms, and feelings are valued by the teacher.	9. The classroom is a place to transmit information. These needs of the student should be met elsewhere.
10. The student learns more through cooperative interaction with peers. Most competition is destructive.	10. Competition motivates the student and prepares him for the real world.

Participative education is thus not a modification of the traditional system. In many respects it is diametrically opposed. It is difficult for a person who has had little or no exposure to participative education to understand the approach, because it does not make sense from the traditional frame of reference. Even when it is understood and accepted, making the change is difficult, for both faculty and students. We have all been conditioned from many years' experience in the traditional system, to a pattern of attitudes, expectations, behaviors, and reactions that are dysfunctional in participative education. These have to be unlearned as we learn our new roles. We continue to respond to the familiar clues of the classroom in traditional ways even after we are convinced that what we are doing is wrong.

But no matter how difficult, the change must be made. We can no longer tolerate a dehumanizing system, one that contributes immeasurably to the mounting social problems rather than preparing man to cope with and solve these problems. The emphasis on direction and control of the student denies him the opportunity for self-directedness and the resulting growth in self-esteem and self-confidence. The emphasis on failure produces failure and destroys ambition, initiative, and self-respect. The emphasis on achievement at the expense of humanitarian concerns results in values that are contrary to the needs of today's world. The emphasis on competition prevents the person from learning to work and relate effectively with others, to achieve a sense of identity, and to solve problems of conflict in peaceful, mutually growth-producing ways. In times when peaceful solutions to national and international conflict are imperative, this deficiency in our educational system could be disastrous.

Participative education assumes that if a person is treated as responsible, he is more likely to be responsible. If he assumes the responsibility for his own learning, he is more likely to continue learning outside and beyond his formal education. If he is involved in meaningful goal-setting, problem-solving, and decision-making activities, he will be better equipped and more likely to engage in these activities as a mature, responsible citizen. If he learns to work cooperatively with others in these activities, he will have greater respect and concern for others, and will be more likely to be able to find constructive solutions to the problems of interpersonal, inter-cultural, and international conflict. Success experiences in personally meaningful activities will result in increased self-esteem, self-confidence, self-directedness, initiative, and responsibility, and should result in a healthier society made up of healthier individuals.

If we face reality, we have no choice. The traditional system cannot survive. Participative education offers an alternative that, if its underlying assumptions are correct, is more likely to meet the needs of today's rapidly changing, conflict-ridden world.

SESSION 6:

THE DYNAMICS OF INTERDISCIPLINARY DEPARTMENTS AND PROBLEM SOLVING AS A TEACHING TECHNIQUE

Conveners: James W. Kolka
E. Nelson Swinerton

JAMES KOLKA (University of Wisconsin, Green Bay):

I'd like to spend a few minutes trying to identify the level of our interdisciplinary development at UWGB (University of Wisconsin, Green Bay) to provide some sort of base line for discussion. Hopefully, this will solidify our discussions a bit and avoid comparing pears with oranges. We have at Green Bay twelve interdisciplinary concentrations. These are the primary units for faculty and for student course work. Consequently, no faculty promotion occurs within a disciplinary unit. A discipline, in other words, does not have final control over promotion decisions—as promotions are decided on the interdisciplinary level. This is one way in which interdisciplinary work has been implemented.

In the beginning of our program at UWGB the interdisciplinary divisions started out in traditional categories. For example, two interdisciplinary units were created in the area traditionally known as "the humanities" and three interdisciplinary units were created in the area traditionally known as "the social sciences." Over the past two years the traditional divisions have softened and we now find philosophers and biologists in an area called "Population Dynamics" and historians and biologists cooperating in interdisciplinary units called "Eco-systems Analysis" and "Modernization Processes." I realize these terms are a bit fuzzy to people hearing them for the first time, so I will briefly clarify. The unit labeled "Modernization Processes" studies social change and is composed of sociologists, anthropologists, economists, psychologists, political scientists, more recently includes historians and is developing some cooperative efforts with biologists. The unit labeled "Eco-systems Analysis" studies the various inhabitants of ecosystems from people to plants and animals. In addition to including various types of biologists, chemists, botanists, physiologists and mathematicians, this unit has developed cooperative efforts with engineers, philosophers and economists. In brief, that is where we are at and we have discovered a number of things which influence interdisciplinary collaborations.

First, it seems imperative to have a free flow of communication. This can be facilitated by such a simple thing as being housed in a single building where people can see each other fairly frequently. If people are expected to work in different interdisciplinary units, they must be physically able to communicate. Since we expect that some people will change their problem orientation, for example in two years, their offices may be changed so that students and faculty will be able to associate with each other in this new setting. Secondly, faculty hierarchy becomes a critical factor. If somebody is standing in the midst of an interdisciplinary unit saying that he wants deference because he is a full professor and therefore his opinion counts more than another, this tends to be both disruptive and counterproductive. In those few instances (relatively few so far) where this has occurred, it has destroyed attempts at interdisciplinary collaboration. What frequently happens with this type of stress is the development of interdisciplinary units which reward along disciplinary lines, but pretend that they are living in interdisciplinary settings. Most of our units have not done this primarily because 80 per cent of our faculty are at the assistant professor level; in other words, we have a junior faculty. Fortunately, most of the time we have had a mix of junior and senior faculty and open communication has evolved.

For interdisciplinary cooperation the lesson seems to be, when a person possesses a particular expertise, it should emerge by way of demonstration. When a person is shown deference because of professional skill, it should come from demonstrated competence, not from a demand for deference due to a certain rank awarded by the university.

These are a few of the major points which we have observed influence the development of interdisciplinary units. I'd like briefly to relate some of my own experiences in this regard. I have been involved in three interdisciplinary efforts. One of these efforts was a concentration (departmental unit) and the second was a research program to examine problems in inland lake decay (eutrophication) in the Upper Great Lakes Region. I discovered that it was easy for a person with my background (political science and lawyer) to state to a marine biologist that I couldn't understand what he was saying. This query coming from a person with a social science background did not constitute an ego threat and my biologist colleague was able to clarify the meaning of his statement to assist my understanding. In turn, he was able to ask me to clarify my own statements and it was not threatening for me to assist his understanding of my social science input. On that particular interdisciplinary team, communication was open and non-threatening. In addition, the team was also composed of junior faculty, which seemed to facilitate open communication among colleagues.

The third effort was a faculty teaching team who were attempting to abolish individual introductory social science courses such as Introduction to Psychology, Sociology, Political Science, etc. The outcome of this effort was to be a two semester course which would link social science perspectives and introduce students to an integrated perspective which would reduce existing segmented views of the social world. The end product of this approach would hopefully produce people who see linkages and discourage political scientists from concluding that political development had little to do with social change or economic development and vice versa.

The evolution of this particular interdisciplinary team and the participating social science interdisciplinary department experienced greater difficulty than the lake research team. For example when a political scientist or anthropologist challenges a fellow sociologist that his concept of "role" is not as well developed as their own, it causes a bit of strain. Specifically, in one instance I made the comment that we should adopt the sociological concept of "role" for use in class because it was more efficient than its use as a concept in anthropology and political science. This caused a bit of friction with the anthropologists who figuratively climbed the wall at such a suggestion. With time, tempers cooled and professional egos were less inclined to flare at such suggestions.

On the latter interdisciplinary team it has taken us between a year to a year and a half to develop a mutual exchange and overcome the ego threats and interdisciplinary frictions which emerged from time to time. Ironically, I discovered that the closer you are to each other's disciplines, the more difficult it is to communicate and the further away you are intellectually, communication improves. The rule is not hard and fast, but worthy of note. I will now terminate my observations and turn the platform over to my colleague, Al Swinerton.

E. NELSON SWINERTON (UWGB):

I would like to go around the room and take a few minutes to see where each of us is in relation to the development of interdisciplinary departments. I am especially interested in discovering how many people have formed, or are interested in forming, interdisciplinary units or problem-oriented units. We would like to talk to some others to compare experiences with our own development at Green Bay.

One problem encountered by participation in interdisciplinary units is the mobility of faculty. For example, if a faculty member comes to Green Bay and participates in our program, where can he or she go from there? If a person is interested in developing an interdisciplinary program, they potentially threaten their ability to find another job in a traditional disciplinary department. Recently, two of our faculty left our university to join other interdisciplinary programs. In their change of jobs these persons received promotions and a larger salary. We consider these moves to be a success story and we were happy to see them occur. It provided the first concrete evidence that one could participate in our academic program and not restrict his mobility in the academic world.

I would like to find out where we are in general in the formation of interdisciplinary and problem-oriented departments. Perhaps we can learn from each other and figure out how successful programs function and how to assist other units to function in academic settings. In other words, let's find out where each of us is at and what has succeeded and what has failed. I am going to turn the program over to all of you in this room to describe your interests and experiences.

RAY GEIGLE (California State College, Bakersfield):

We are in our second year of operation. We were originally set up to be interdisciplinary. The decision was made somewhere in the diplomatic process that we would have faculty departments and that the departments would have certain powers which are generally located in schools in the University. I went to Cal State and said, "Hey, I'm interested in interdisciplinary instruction." It has become very difficult, because some departments are interested in this type of operation and others want to be autonomous. We have experienced the problem that you were talking about. We have a development course and as a political scientist I would like to have an interdisciplinary development course with economists and anthropologists. Unfortunately, some of the economists think that interdisciplinary instruction is phony, and we presently have a course taught by an anthropologist and a political scientist, which makes what we're doing a little difficult. I think that institutional constraints make it difficult to have interdisciplinary instruction.

SWINERTON:

I'd be interested in knowing how you resolved some of the problems like evaluation, peer promotion, evaluation for tenure. How do you decide whether you hire a political scientist, anthropologist or sociologist? When you are located in an interdisciplinary structure, how do you decide if three or four of you go to the classroom at the same time or divide the class into small sections depending on your background? There is a whole series of minor problems associated with instruction, which can turn out to be very large in implementation. I would like to have some input from each of you on these points. Let's continue around the room and see how each of you meets these problems.

ROBERT W. WALLACE (Mankato State College, Minnesota):

I am interested in a number of areas. Right now I am participating in an interdisciplinary course concerning the eighteenth century, the Enlightenment period. There are eleven of us from various disciplines—music, art, history, political science, physics . . . I am in philosophy myself. I apparently left out some of the other disciplines, but there are eleven of us teaching the course and we have input from this group and a smaller input from fifteen or twenty other professors. It is quite an interesting experiment. I think we can do period studies because we are already offering a whole raft of courses in these early periods and we are going to try to put them together in new relationships with a core team-taught interdisciplinary course. We will interrelate the material, but allow the students to plug in their other disciplinary courses in the period under study. By this method we will have a core team-taught course which relates to existing disciplinary courses covering the same period.

PHILLIP G. HUBBARD (University of Iowa):

We are trying to get some interdisciplinary courses on deck. We are presently in the discussion stage and we have brought up a number of the problems you are alluding to and attempting to figure out how to alleviate some of these difficulties. We are trying to short-circuit some of the problems and develop some interdisciplinary courses.

COMMENT (San Bernardino Valley College):

We have an interdisciplinary studies division that is in its second year. Our problems are somewhat similar. One of the things I have been thinking about in the last couple of months is the creation of new courses and new patterns for getting people in interdisciplinary studies. One of the problems that invariably seems to be reoccurring in our institution is we have to think big! That is, we must have big enrollment courses before we can justify two or three instructors together in a classroom. The problem with that type of approach is you must sacrifice in order to get people together to see relationships and develop the expertise which each person contributes. To do this you need to develop a degree of intimacy on the research team. And in my view lately, I worry that intimacy is more important in these situations than expertise. The development of an intimate teaching approach vs. the economics of large classes is one that I would like to hear someone tell me about.

SWINERTON:

I am also interested in teams which combine professional leadership in the community with community problem solving.

GREG McALLISTER (Lone Mountain College, San Francisco):

The problem I see comes down to a large number of older faculty who have received a fragmented type of education. About the only way I have had any success in interdisciplinary teaching is by utilizing a project oriented approach. I am beginning to conclude that project orientation is the answer to my idea of a college, at least in an urban area. It is necessary to develop a research center where you hire teachers as research personnel, rather than people who are going to be in classrooms all of the time—then it will be possible to plug a lot of people into those resources, to do specific jobs in the city. I am interested in the whole area of the mass media, urban areas and the problem of setting up an educational radio station in Berkeley which will involve students in newscasts, and things of that sort. Then, hopefully, we will link our efforts with other areas such as job employment departments, perform radio dramas and things of that sort. This is a first priority and it is the level where things are going to happen.

SWINERTON:

Essentially, we are merging two types of interdisciplinary approaches. One appears to be an autonomous approach which strives toward the development of new types of interdisciplinary approaches and insights. This sort of technique also relates to new types of social problems. The other approach is primarily concerned with the dynamics of integrating different disciplines to deal with problems on an interdisciplinary basis. Unfortunately, our choices and interests are not simple problems which can be solved by asking for better term papers from the students. The difficulty of relating to existing social problems is every bit as perplexing as devising ways for the different disciplines to cooperate on an interdisciplinary basis. It would appear that we have identified some real problems.

CAROL ADAMS (University of California, Los Angeles):

I am at this workshop because I am not satisfied with our approach to interdisciplinary courses. At the present time the emphasis with our Council on Education is geared to courses which do not relate to any particular department. Our problem is identifying with a department which is sympathetic to interdisciplinary courses. In order to attract people to interdisciplinary efforts it is necessary to find unusual departments which are independent from disciplinary motives.

ELSA RIEMER (Student, Huxley College, Western Washington State College):

Huxley College is an environmental school and one of the major interdisciplinary programs in the state of Washington. Right now we have no building, no labs, no nothing, so if a student wants to develop a problem solving experience, he has to go out and hustle his own equipment. I think this is great, because he has to visit each of the related departments in the university. Very soon we will have our own building, our own labs and more faculty. It will be really easy to solve problems, just sit right in the middle of the building and do it. Right now there are six possible interdisciplinary concentrations in environmental studies and they are beginning to solidify. The study units are becoming sorted out, even faculty are sorting into concentrations. So a faculty member must spend 90 per cent of his time teaching water pollution control. I think we would like to see more shared faculty in the larger institution and more faculty moving around from program to program.

GERALD SHERBA (Caifornia State College, San Bernardino):

We are interested in developing three different kinds of programs: problem-centered courses, interdisciplinary courses and interdisciplinary departments. The problem we seem to be facing is that this type of commitment represents a strong risk for the faculty. I think Bakersfield has the same problem concerning promotion, tenure, professional status and something called advancement. In order to do this, working in an interdisciplinary setting is both difficult and time consuming. The tangible rewards don't seem to be there, at least thus far we are not clever enough to construct them. So, I am trying to pick up some ideas from this session which we might apply to our university.

KOLKA:

What has been the experience of the University of Massachusetts with interdisciplinary programs?

PAT CROSSAN (University of Massachusetts):

I am interested in three different areas of concern. First, we have some interdisciplinary units and I'm interested in how to make these programs more effective and perhaps relate more with students rather than become mere faculty exercises. Second, how do you overcome resistance of existing departmental structures at the university level? Third, how do you encourage the development of these types of approaches?

GWENDOLYN COOKE (Morgan State College):

I am just interested in the process of setting up an interdisciplinary program.

MARY EAKIN (University of Northern Iowa):

We have what we think is a very good cluster college plan.

Our faculty is funded by our administration and each of us would like to see faculty working on individual interdisciplinary programs. At present we have environmental programs (going into the third year) and urban studies programs (going into the second year.) One question which has been raised a number of times by people on our faculty in our interdisciplinary programs and which might be interesting to think about is a fear of participating in interdisciplinary programs. For example, a two year commitment to such a program raises fears of losing one's place in a department and having a disciplinary home to which one can return. Whether this is a problem which can be solved or whether it is simply a matter of ego strength and self-confidence remains to be seen. It may be a real problem or it may simply say something about our faculty.

SWINERTON:

This point coincides with the mobility question which I mentioned earlier. Does interdisciplinary participation so threaten disciplinary requirements that it diverts participation from disciplinary departments and makes these faculty bastards both in their own university and the outside world of their disciplines?

SEYMOUR SIMCHES (Tufts University):

We tried the humanistic studies approach where we zeroed in on a similar period of time (the 18th Century Renaissance) with seven departments, and it didn't work. People brought with them their specializations and their own constraints. Sometimes they worked together and sometimes not, more often not. Now we are trying a separate college within the university with a student problem-oriented triadic approach. Rather than having a disciplinary team, with each faculty member bringing in his specific specialization, he brings in his own particular view of reality seen through his own method as a scientist, social scientist, or artist. Instead of faculty-generated, our approach is now student-generated.

JAMES ROGERS (Northern Arizona University):

We are completely interdisciplinary. At present we have three concerns. First, the administrative concern, how can we provide the safeguards that faculty have expressed to some of you who have already spoken this morning?

We have eliminated departments entirely. Because of our major focus on the students, the other areas of concern become secondary. Our approach is somewhat different as we use interdisciplinary team teaching and individual instruction. We allow students to take grades and final exams and we allow students to take no final exams. The students have the freedom to make these choices if they will take the responsibility.

This raises our third area of concern. We have found that our students, when given the opportunity to freely design their curriculum, the majority (I am not saying all of our students) choose after a couple of months, to adopt a more straight or traditional academic approach. This has been a very serious problem. It would appear that we are trying to do things which the students really do not want. However, we do feel that the interdisciplinary aspect of these problems has been a most effective analytic and teaching device.

KOLKA:

This observation coincides with our experience at Green Bay. Those programs which are entirely student designed are available, but generally attract highly motivated students. Most of the students opt for a more structured interdisciplinary curriculum. We don't feel that all students must design their own program, rather that option should be available to students who seek a greater hand in the design of their program. This appears to be a limited number of highly motivated students.

HARRY RITCHIE (Tufts University):

I handle an experimental college which is essentially not a college at all, but an organization for generating individual courses which are offered as they are needed. The approach we use is problem solving. One of the techniques we are playing with is hiring faculty who demonstrate excellence outside of their discipline or non-disciplinary excellence. For example, we hired a biologist, not to discuss biology, but because he knows something else. We hope to cut down on impositions of faculty hierarchies and adherence to specific disciplines. At present no faculty member is teaching students in terms of a particular discipline. Everyone is teaching students on the basis of their background in addition to their specific expertise.

JUDD GRENIER (California State College, Domingues Hills):

It is really amazing how many things have been said so far with which I am in total agreement. We have had interdisciplinary approaches throughout our college's existence. Every student in our school takes two majors, a disciplinary major and an interdisciplinary major. Our interdisciplinary fields have not been channeled into disciplinary departments and I hope to God they never will be, because most of the faculty prefer to work in interdisciplinary settings. Fortunately the interests of the faculty are strong in the interdisciplinary areas.

We have had some of the same problems you have already discussed. Specifically, in team teaching it takes a while for the individual ego threats to be overcome. There is always the threat of disciplinary specializations dominating interdisciplinary programs, but there are also certain disciplines which, I think, do a better job in these programs because something in their training made them more amenable to interdisciplinary work than others. I think disciplines like sociology, history, and psychology do a pretty good job with the interdepartmental kinds of things. Other subjects, for example economics and music, don't do as good a job. We are doing away with approaches such as American Studies, Afro-American Studies, etc., and structuring programs solely on a project-solving basis. We thematically organize work toward an area such as a study of urban decay. Then we contact any discipline which would have something to offer. In sum, that is where we are at now.

STEPHANIE ADAMS (Scripps College):

Somebody mentioned the cluster college concept—we at Scripps, which is one of the Claremont colleges, are one of the prototypes for the cluster colleges in the United States. Scripps is a women's college, oriented around the humanities, and by definition it becomes interdisciplinary in focus. This is part of the whole concept of the colleges, so in a sense we don't debate the quality of interdisciplinary teaching because it's at the core of the entire curriculum. This approach constitutes one quarter of the curriculum for the first three years of college.

The courses are designed both chronologically and by theme. In other words, we offer seven-week seminars and students are required to take twelve of them during their four years of college. The courses are designed by ancient, medieval, renaissance and contemporary chronologies and then by theme—such as nature of the hero, war and revolution, and the ages of man. In addition, we have courses in which we deal with perception and analysis and which are really looking at how you approach various kinds of subject matter. What do you do when you approach literature and what do you do when you approach science?

Probably two-thirds of our faculty teach in the humanities seminars, which is a major emphasis of the institution. Consequently just about everybody has to bring themselves to an interdisciplinary sort of approach. It sounds very ideal in many ways and it is. We came out of a long tradition of this type of teaching, so we are not simply developing a new kind of experimental approach.

What we find our problem to be and what I would like to discuss with anybody here who comes from a tradition such as this, is how one builds two elements into this type of program. One element is cohesion because there is no specified manner in which a student must take these seminars. They can take them from any period of time and any theme. As a result it is difficult for the students to pull together a sense of what comes out of the whole thing. This type of experience tends to be fragmented and frustrating for the students, since they don't possess the background to fit the pieces into place.

Second, with the exception of some faculty who have been at Scripps for a long time, it is difficult to instruct new faculty how to teach in an interdisciplinary fashion. This has become a major hurdle for new faculty who acquired their Ph.D's in defined disciplines and who now find themselves in interest areas rather than departments. How do we help these new faculty to teach in an interdisciplinary course? There is considerable student resistance to faculty who are teaching interdisciplinary seminars in the humanities which are supposed to bring together all sorts of historical, religious and secular information into the course in a fully integrated format. Because many of our faculty are young and fresh out of disciplinary graduate schools, they do not understand how one goes about teaching interdisciplinary courses.

On top of these difficulties is the terrible aura of the autonomy of the classroom and underlying questions of academic freedom. Who is going to move in and tell someone how to teach their own courses? With these sorts of prohibitions on improving interdisciplinary teaching, it has become very easy for each person to do their own thing in the classroom. In brief this outlines some of our problems. We do not give grades, and instead give written evaluations, that's all. At present we have considerable student feedback on the approaches of their colleagues to courses.

KOLKA:

At the expense of over-exposure, let me briefly relate our experience with these points. First, we specifically state at UWGB that we have no required courses and students are free to design their own curriculum. Obviously, advanced courses in mathematics are difficult if not impossible without proper groundwork. Likewise, random choices in history or the social sciences could leave students with intellectually unrelated fragments. To overcome this problem each of our interdisciplinary concentrations have designated at least one of the faculty members to be active in advising students (with a reduction of one course per semester in his or her work load). We have found this to be most satisfactory. While students are strongly advised to develop an integrated program, those students who wish to bypass steps by self study can do so.

Second, we hire faculty on both their competence and flexibility. In the early stages at Green Bay we sought "Renaissance Men." Instead, we found broadly educated faculty who knew a little bit of many things, but did not demonstrate "in depth" competence in a particular field. We then changed the proverbial horses in midstream. We began to seek persons who demonstrated competence in a particular field and who had an acquaintance with other fields and were excited about developing interdisciplinary programs. In sum we began looking for disciplinary competence, flexibility, and intellectual curiosity rather than broad training.

SWINERTON:

Before we continue around the room, I would like to add to Jim's comments and respond to the latter part of your question. At Green Bay we also experienced your frustration with new disciplinary trained faculty in interdisciplinary courses. To overcome these problems, we move new faculty into experienced teaching teams. Since the team jointly teaches the course and are expected to jointly plan, participate and/or attend each class session the initial contact of a new faculty member occurs in a team setting. We find this reduces the fear of this approach with the resulting defensive (aloof) posture and acts as both an input and teaching mechanism. Second, while academic freedom is an obvious concern to the academic world, it has also been used as a device to shield incompetence and avoid professional accountability to faculty and students. To overcome this point we have instituted both faculty and student evaluation of teachers and courses. These evaluations are built into the system, are conducted by each concentration, the Office of Educational Development, and students, and are weighed in annual salary increases and faculty promotion. Even though this initially met with some faculty resistance, it seems to be operating fairly well now.

GEORGE P. CONNICK (University of Maine, Portland-Forham):

The University of Maine, Portland-Forham is a small university center with two campuses located eleven miles apart. A year ago the faculty voted to develop a general educational alternative for interdisciplinary programs. Just two days ago I heard from the President of the University that the faculty had voted out this alternative due to the traumas of trying to develop two campuses eleven miles apart.

KEN KWANTON (Rio Hondo College, Whittier, California):

This past year we had a student-faculty committee working on establishing an experimental college. Our new plan began last fall. We have main themes or goals. One is community involvement. The second is problem exploration and the third is interdisciplinary in orientation. We plan to take faculty members from the various departments, place them in the exploratory college and then have them complete the interdisciplinary orientation of those departments.

We have one major area of concern which we have not solved *as of* yet. We seem to be able to solve the interdisciplinary program within the humanities, social sciences, political science, anthropology, etc.; but 30 per cent of our student body were able to pass through vocational programs: business, nursing, engineering, technology. This type of discipline seems to be left out. It seems that most of the interdisciplinary efforts occur within specific disciplinary areas. Hopefully, we will be able to bring in some of the other areas which are not as well developed for interdisciplinary programs, such as psychology and business.

COMMENT (Roger Williams College):

I am involved with two programs: University Without Walls and I also teach as a member of the faculty of Roger Williams College. We hear about University Without Walls as student problem solving which some of you are talking about. In UWW a student pretty much creates his own curriculum from his surroundings—his environment, courses, experiences, etc. A student can pretty much decide what he wants to put together or tackle specific problems and he can choose problems from any source.

In addition, he can pick his own faculty. It seems to work pretty well and we get good results with the program. Students begin to see relationships with different kinds of things. For example, a student could learn accounting, if he wants to operate a business or if he plans to be selling musical instruments. We have one student who's interested in building harpsichords and selling them. He is in the process of learning all the business techniques plus building a harpsichord, learning how to write music and how to play the harpsichord.

Whether it be cabinet making, machine operation, or building a harpsichord, a student puts together this sort of interdisciplinary project and consolidates all the necessary relationships.

I'm also interested in the dynamics of team teaching. We have had some success with the model described earlier for a course in political development. We have a course in child development which is team taught. The teachers let each other take over and let members of the class take over. Another thing we have tried is taking a book; I will read it and I will give my evaluation to the class. Then another fellow does the same thing with another book which is similar and this sets up a model for people in the class to evaluate books. It seems to work pretty well.

JUDD ADAMS (UCLA Graduate School of Education):

At the Center for the Study of Evaluation in Higher Education at UCLA we do research and evaluation on higher education at national and institutional levels. Our primary focus has been the undergraduate level. We are attempting to assess what types of evaluation needs people have, which is the primary reason that we are at this symposium. Also, we are interested in the kinds of research problems which seem to be in most need of being examined. At present we are producing a loose-leaf evaluation kit which has a set of scales and brief mini-tests with somewhere from five to twenty items asking about a particular area of concern which could be given to students for evaluation. This would provide feedback on a systems level of how much certain activities are going on. It's not a test for individual diagnosis, but simply a monitor of what's happening on the systems level.

For example, we identify five areas of activity to be assessed and we test these out on the undergraduate and graduate levels. We have that resource and we will make it available to anyone who is interested, but we are also here to find out what evaluations you people have, so that we might utilize this sort of information.

COMMENT (Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio):

I'm here to see what other schools are doing and how to set up interdisciplinary programs. The main problem we have had is with the departments and faculty promotions. The faculty, as they leave the department and participate in interdisciplinary programs —I'm afraid they lose their rights.

WALTER TUBBS (Johnston College):

I'm interested in all the things I've been hearing about here. But something that is of particular concern to me right now is the whole question of departments. How do you get away from them? We have tried here at Johnston, as you know, by using the notion of different "dimensions"—interpersonal, international . . . .

I wonder if a department by any other name isn't still a problem? To say that it is possible to do away with departments or that this has been done, immediately raises in my mind the question: What are they called now? Because there is usually some other structure which performs those functions. And very soon I begin to get the feeling of being caught once again in the departmental trap. I would really like to know how to get out of the circular problem.

I think that problem ties in very intimately with the whole business of how one can change the style of teaching. Many, probably most of us, want to be broader than is suggested by the notion of single-discipline expertise. We want to be, in some sense, "non-disciplined." But how do we do that? How can we educate ourselves to change toward a more flexible and responsive system?

SWINERTON:

It is interesting that departmental jealousies and fiefdoms continually emerge at various universities and tend to threaten new programs. It would appear that disciplinary ambitions are a major obstacle to interdisciplinary efforts. Apparently, academic freedom doesn't apply in university politics.

JAMES BOOKBINDER (University of Toronto):

At Toronto we have one of the colleges of the University which specializes in innovative programs as well as so-called departments of interdisciplinary studies. However, the problem with both of these units is that they are not independent, they cannot grant tenure and they draw their faculty from the regular departments of the parent institution. As such they depend for their welfare upon the goodwill of persons who are interested in this type of program. I find myself in the position that I would like to move in the direction of interdisciplinary studies, but my work in the physics department is considered to be separate. Consequently, work in interdisciplinary units doesn't count in the departments. I don't see any way out, except to allow the interdisciplinary unit to be independent. To obtain that will encounter the stiff objections of the departments.

There is just one question that I would like to ask. I know one of the earlier speakers mentioned that he was interested in the hiring of biologists who could handle more than biology. Now I wonder though, how you actually find people like that, because a person makes his contacts and makes his reputation as a biologist and he is known to his colleagues as a biologist. If he would happen to have more to offer outside of his field, how would he convey this and how would interdisciplinary units know about him?

JOHN MACTAVISH (William James College):

William James College is one of a cluster of colleges called Grand Valley State College in Michigan. Thomas Jefferson is another of the colleges at Grand Valley—some of you might have heard of Thomas Jefferson. We are in our second term of an interdisciplinary problem oriented curriculum. The school has a built-in schizophrenia and it is interesting that in the personal development of the students is the same kind of professional orientation which is demonstrated by disciplinary departments.

My personal interest is in the possibility of humane education in the natural sciences. I haven't seen much of it and I would like to hear from anyone who has. We are trying to do a lot of things. We very idealistically hired seven people who had never met each other before and put them together, called it a college and gave them 150 freshmen. Now we are looking at the consequences. We are doing very well and we have the autonomy that most of you seem to be lacking. We have our own staff and our own budget. If anyone knows of experiments in interdisciplinary or non-disciplinary science education, I would like to hear about it.

ANN HALL (The Para College of St. Olaf College, Minnesota):

One of the main issues around the room seems to be the administrative setup of the university in regard to interdisciplinary programs. In Para College, which is the experimental college of St. Olaf, those of us who are full-time faculty in the college are all members of departments of the so-called regular college and we all teach one course in the regular college. This means that we are members of two departments. The Para College faculty in many ways functions as a department and of course has its meetings. In addition, each of us is also a member of a disciplinary department in St. Olaf College; we attend all its meetings and serve on its committees. The time consumption difficulty with this is obvious. The problem that some of you are talking about is more or less taken care of, because we can move between the Para College and our regular departments. If the trustees decide not to continue the Para College we do have a home in the regular college (St. Olaf College).

Our formal offerings in Para College are almost entirely interdisciplinary. The students in their first two years are offered syllabi which are lectures or discussions or combinations of both with reading lists attached for the humanities, natural sciences and social sciences. One session combining the physical and biological sciences in which I have been involved found biologists talking about acoustics. They really did tie these two perspectives together for the students.

COMMENT (Loretto Heights College, Denver):

Loretto Heights is a traditional school that is interested in finding out about more experimental programs. Our school is divided in two sections; one is the division of social sciences. This semester we have a whole list of interdisciplinary courses and, as far as I can tell, it seems to be working pretty well. There are seven or eight faculty members working in these programs and the topics are very broad. In addition, the faculty also has members who will help the University Without Walls program, which seems to be working a lot better, because the students who get into the program are highly self-motivated toward an educational experience which is problem oriented and interdisciplinary in nature. We are just starting these programs and that is where we are at.

KOLKA:

I am going to jump in and make a few comments. Among the many things we are examining, I see two major points which have been brought out in the discussion. The nature of the institution, in particular the structure of the institution, is one of the points we have considered. Second, and perhaps more important, are the behavioral dynamics which emerge in different structures. Both points are relevant to the development of interdisciplinary programs. Even though different universities may appear to be structurally identical, the behavioral dynamics may operate quite differently.

Although Green Bay is a unit of the University of Wisconsin system, we do not have a parent unit to which we report in terms of our academic program. Essentially, we are one of several autonomous units in a university system and we are individually responsible for the direction of our interdisciplinary program and the organizational structure of Green Bay.

The largest institution in the University of Wisconsin is the Madison campus which has about 35,000 students. The first attempts of that campus to create interdisciplinary programs was done through the borrowing process from existing departments, which did not work very well, because professional survival and promotion was determined by the parent department. An example of a recent attempt to attain structural autonomy on that campus was a success of the Institute of Environmental Studies in persuading the Chancellor of the University, the Board of Regents and the faculty to give the Institute divisional status within the university. This means that tenure, promotion and salary merit increase lie entirely within that interdisciplinary unit. As a result, faculty reside within the Institute and are no longer dependent upon the disciplinary departments for survival.

Granted, there is a certain degree of risk in this type of operation, but certain types of people, such as agricultural economists, have always lived between the boundaries of more traditional disciplines. This type of separate unit is now compatible with the manner in which they were intellectually raised. Fortunately, such persons have developed their own avenues for publication and the meeting of traditional standards. If we are talking about the participation of political scientists or physicists who view themselves as members of traditional disciplines, I suppose these people must resign themselves for the present to being bastards within their fields. They will have to assume the role of intellectual martyrs with the expectation that in the future —perhaps five years hence—their work will be received more benevolently.

The previous example represents a structural change within a traditional university which accommodates the development of a non-traditional (interdisciplinary) program. The second example refers to the behavioral dynamics dimension of institutions of higher education. We recently had the opportunity to compare notes with a Dean from Simon-Fraser University in Vancouver, British Columbia. They have achieved interdisciplinary programs by borrowing faculty from traditional departments. Their experience varies from the previous example, because they have successfully brought about the sharing of faculty. All I am able to conclude from their efforts is the hard work of some faculty and administrators to create a climate of goodwill and trust between the interdisciplinary programs and traditional departments.

This level of cooperation and tolerance appears to have been created by a dean and some faculty members who are running back and forth between the units saying, "Look, we have a budget to hire faculty and we want to cooperate with your department by paying the salary for the part time your faculty members teach in our program. This gives you an opportunity to expand your faculty by our assuming a part of your costs." The Dean was fearful that his efforts were a bit tenuous and the process of building interdisciplinary programs was taking a longer period of time than he had originally expected. However, I think given his circumstance, he was probably developing a successful interdisciplinary program. Given the experience of most universities with shared programs, he had achieved a notable success. Enough of my comments, we need to continue the observations around the room.

WILLIAM HALLORAN (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee):

I am in the administration at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. We are not as large as the Madison Campus yet, but will be soon. At present we have about 22,000 students and we are organized into departmental units very much like Madison. As you already know, this creates a problem as it is a little difficult getting new programs underway. The University is structured departmentally, but I always take the view that departments are not as sacred as they seem to be. Rather, the departments are simply disciplines. This provides a way out for us since it would be very difficult to break down structure. This has happened at Green Bay, but in a very different kind of situation than ours. So, I think we can create new departments and perhaps not call them departments.

The thing that interests me most is the possibility of turning this process around and focusing on students rather than on organizations. We are trying to do this by asking students, in effect, to create programs by developing specific majors. This requires that the student go around soliciting assistance from faculty members of various departments by getting them to talk to each other. This process seems to be happening more and more.

This type of procedure places the responsibility for interdisciplinary studies on the students themselves. In addition, we encourage and support giving faculty time for advising students on an individual basis. I think we can accomplish a lot of the goals which are difficult to accomplish by this method rather than by reorganizing departments and moving personnel in and out.

PAUL DRESSEL (Michigan State University):

I was originally trained in mathematics and I think it was Lord Russell who said mathematics is the field where people don't know what they are talking about and they don't care whether what they say is true or not. I don't know what interdisciplinary is, really, because we have many terms such as supradisciplinary, trans-disciplinary, cross-disciplinary, and multi-disciplinary which all allude to integrating different disciplinary approaches to subject matter. It often seems to me when I see faculty become uncomfortable and irked with an existing set of structures, they attempt to impose a new structure.

Let me give you an example of a classroom technique I use in a seminar where we are supposed to discuss curriculum and instruction in higher education. I should digress to observe that the person who initiates this sort of discussion must be a fool or a supreme egotist. One of my graduate students looked at me and stated, "You could be both."

Anyway, I start the discussion by saying we will have none of the nonsense in this seminar about students deciding what they want. This seminar exists to do three things: (1) get you acquainted with some of the major problems in higher education in the area of curriculum development, (2) get you acquainted with some of the major points in higher education and resources available, (3) get you to the point where you have some opinions and judgments of your own on which to develop your own opinions. If you don't want that, get out!

This exercise ends up by taking us into economics, sociology, psychology and other disciplines. I believe the disciplines are all involved, and I have a long list of readings which I tell the students to read. I require each student to submit five papers. If you don't want to do that much work, get out of the seminar! The reason for the papers is that you are not going to get your ideas organized and you are not going to know what you think until you try to express those ideas in writing. I promise every time you turn in a paper, it will be returned to you by the next class meeting. So I am going to work as hard, probably harder than anyone in this course. I do that, I live up to that challenge. I further say if you won't come to class, I don't care. You know now what we are supposed to be doing in this course. However, before you complete this course, you will write these five papers and I will react to them. In addition, the papers will have to be spread over a period of time. If you turn in all five papers at once and want to be through, I will send them back to you. I can't accept papers in a lump sum because this is a continuing educational program and I want to react to incorrect information or incomplete analyses. This course has to be developmental.

I don't want that process to be "interdisciplinary," but rather, I want the students to get into a variety of disciplines. I think it is evident that in the course we started out with a problem, a set of concerns, and then we dug into the things that were relevant. To me, this is far more significant than the concept of interdisciplinary, the meaning of which I fail to grasp. Too frequently interdisciplinary turns to be the imposition of another kind of structure. I am reminded that on our campus, which has around 42,000 students, a tremendous number of new buildings have been constructed. As new departments are placed in these buildings, almost invariably the chairman of a department and his faculty get together and express a concern about partitions separating the disciplines from one another. Ten years later, a new department is located in a building and the same concerns are again expressed. I think most of the interdisciplinary collaboration I see is simply this type of phenomenon, tearing up some partitions and putting it in a different setting. Instead of restructuring departments physically within a university, it is more important to develop interdisciplinary perspectives within departments.

COMMENT:

I read the term non-disciplinary several times and I would like to put a slightly cynical cast on it, which I have so far not received and which I think is important. We are in the third year of our program and I think, in response to Johnston College, I could show you a college which has gotten away from departments— we *are* autonomous. I was trying to figure out which metaphor I could use, perhaps something about the baby with the bath water would be appropriate. As regards our college the baby was gone with the bath water! We are presently stuck in the process of becoming non-disciplinary.

The first person on our faculty to use the term non-disciplinary was an individual who quit and he used the term when he resigned. This dynamic is one of the things, one of the "facts of life" which we have learned as we entered our third year of existence as an institution beginning to appreciate some of the difficulties inherent in this type of program. We are willing to recognize, that in our circumstances, it is extremely difficult to do an old-fashioned kind of thing. It is horrible to find yourself in experimental education and discover that you are, in fact, an arch conservative.

At any rate, one of the things we are having great difficulty with is finding how we have succeeded in utilizing students to do non-disciplinary work. What we think students are going to need when they declare an orientation does not mesh with student expectations. Our students consistently do projects throughout their lower division work. Presumably this is directed toward getting them in gear so they can pursue independent projects, which forms virtually the sum and substance of upper division work at our college. Without pushing, without trying to appear dictatorial, without directing the students toward fixed programs we must at the same time satisfy the faculty relative to our time and structure. Generally, the faculty come out of different disciplines, yet find themselves sitting in seminars with students and faculty, teaching one another's subjects.

By training I am a biologist, but I find myself teaching all kinds of other things and teaching biology very, very poorly! Some of the circumstances where I am the non-expert is fine but frequently the discussions are shallow and seemingly say little. Everyone talks, whether or not they have anything to say.

We believe that the problem-oriented approach is one answer or substitute for the discipline approach. It goes to the point you were raising in your concern that students not simply exist in an ivory tower. The problem orientation can furnish a bridge between the ivory tower and the big hard world out there. Those are the kinds of problems the students choose to work with.

O.K., what I'm interested in is, what are good problems? Where are the pitfalls of problems you know about already and what are the bright ideas you have about problems? It seems from my experience the strengths and weaknesses of the problem approach, I am unhappy to say, lie with a non-disciplinary education program.

SWINERTON:

What has been the experience of some of the more specialized schools with interdisciplinary work?

ARNOLD RUSKIN (Harvey Mudd College):

Harvey Mudd College is a neighbor in Claremont of the people from Scripps. Our college was founded about fifteen years ago and at that time the college did what was then considered to be revolutionary in engineering education; we established an engineering program without the divisions of civil, mechanical, chemical and so forth. At the same time, we apparently didn't see this as a 100 per cent solution to engineering education, because we then formed departments equivalent to the usual divisions: chemistry, physics, mathematics, etc. At the same time we organized other units of the college with departments of humanities, social sciences, etc. We have been schizophrenic in that particular respect throughout the life of the college.

The humanities and social sciences department, although interdisciplinary in title, did not really run an interdisciplinary program. The departments consisted of people in many different disciplines who ran their own particular courses in a manner parallel to the usual departmental structure. In the early years there was a course in English composition and literature, mostly literature with English attached in a loose fashion. Over the years, other people from that department got into the act. We had some freshman courses from which the students could choose—I think about one each semester—and one might be taught by an historian, another by a psychologist and the third by someone in philosophy or literature or some other field.

About three years ago people became disenchanted with that particular arrangement, because it seemed as if it was too fragmented. This state of dissatisfaction precipitated a study (approximately one year) which included not only what to do about the humanities, but also what to do about freshman science courses. A new freshman division of the faculty was created (which is not a permanent entity). It consists of faculty who are serving in the freshman program for that particular year. Some of these people have part of their work in the upper divisions of their respective departments and in some rare cases some are full time in the freshman division. In general we have one faculty member from each major department who is full time in his division for at least one year in his tenure as a faculty member. The other people from his department are serving on a joint appointment for the year.

Departments have no budget except for minor capital items and supplies and expense. However, each department must identify personnel who are to participate in the freshman division. The department would probably not heed their obligations were they not charged with having to approve the freshman division. I don't know if this is going to keep us out of trouble in the long run, but so far it's been pretty good. It is a departmental responsibility to approve the freshman division. When a man is evaluated by his department, he is questioned on his contribution to his department's obligation to the freshman division. Because we are primarily an undergraduate institution we are not concerned with a man's productivity. The question is how is he contributing to the responsibility of his department? Part of each department's responsibility is to approve and participate in the freshman division and make it work. We haven't had any problems yet!

SWINERTON:

It is now 10:15 A.M. It took us an hour to go around the room. Since there are a couple of minutes left, I would like to make five quick suggestions and throw them out for consideration. The first two suggestions represent two extremes. After listening to this discussion, I realize I would go home a wealthier and more enlightened man if I could lock the doors and throw away the keys until Sunday at 5:00 P.M. The other extreme would be, now that we have found and identified one another, to compare notes informally throughout the duration of this symposium.

Third, we could partially consolidate our efforts by having everyone sign his name and address to a list of participants so that we can correspond from our respective homes as well as comparing notes during the remainder of the conference.

Fourth, we might want to break and attend other sessions and then schedule a continuation of this session in the evening. It seems that we have just opened the topic. We have just learned how each of us has formed interdisciplinary units, how we have respectively administered such programs and how we have applied the problem oriented approach to different academic programs.

Fifth, we could continue this session, divide into groups and reconvene on Sunday to synthesize what we have gained, if anything, from our conversation.

COMMENT:

I have one question. You mentioned Simon-Fraser; one school that I have not heard mentioned was Evergreen State. Does anyone know anything about Evergreen State?

COMMENT:

I recently spent four days visiting Evergreen State in December. In regard to departments there—the departments appear to have abandoned the notion of interdisciplinary studies. Originally, Evergreen State developed twenty programs called Basic Studies and Advanced Studies which were given labels such as Environmental Design or Causality, Chance and Freedom, and so forth. The concept of each program was to have approximately 100 students and five faculty members trained in different disciplines come together and consider social problems affecting our contemporary society. The objective was to discuss problems from a number of disciplinary perspectives that week.

For example, if they were talking about philosophy and the concept of determinism, someone in the group trained in biology who had read philosophy would speak on the topic. Faculty members would ask questions of each other and attempt to help each other in their preparations. Rather than argue perspectives, the faculty would preview their discussions before confronting students. When the topic focused on genetics, which might find the philosopher unable to respond, the biologist would help out by establishing a basis for discussion.

SWINERTON:

Well, I see this brings us to the end of our discussion period. The session has been an interesting national and international cross-section of experiences with the development of interdisciplinary programs. I hope this session has been as instructive for each of you as it has been for Jim Kolka and myself.

SUMMARY

(By James Kolka and E. Nelson Swinerton)

The following conclusions are based on a review of the preceding session on interdisciplinary education and the several informal discussions held with faculty and students attending the National Symposium on Experimental Education hosted by Johnston College. It is not our intent to enumerate all of the factors influencing the development of interdisciplinary programs, but to concentrate on those major factors which appeared again and again in our discussions and which seemed to be the most important variables influencing interdisciplinary education.

1. Interdisciplinary programs are not a new phenomenon of the decade of the 1970's. From past experience, whenever disciplinary boundaries have impeded scholarly inquiry, informal meetings of faculty and students have developed to consider a problem from a new perspective or to gain new insights. Occasionally these informal meetings have proved to be productive and subsequently warranted formalizing the effort into a new discipline such as biochemistry, biophysics, ecology, agricultural economics and political economy, to name a few.
2. Even though interdisciplinary study is a logical evolutionary phase in intellectual curiosity, the need for this type of approach is particularly important to understand the complex problems which face the latter one-third of the 20th century. (In this regard see Thomas Kuhn's insightful book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.) One American philosopher has observed that we are presently watching a gradual shift toward an interdisciplinary form of analysis which he called the "Ecological Approach." "On the theoretical side, an ecological mode of thought involves a systems approach in which there is not only a meeting of different sciences in relation to a particular problem, but there may be a recasting of formulations in the hitherto isolated disciplines." (Abraham Edel, "Scientists, Partisans and Social

Conscience," *Transaction*, Vol. 9, No. 3, Jan., 1972, p. 35.) As emerged repeatedly in the symposium, the nature of problems should and are apparently beginning to dictate the requirements of inquiry. Complex problems need the multifaceted perspectives provided by an interdisciplinary approach.

3. Interdisciplinary programs should be differentiated from multi-disciplinary programs. The latter type of approach refers to several disciplines separately approaching a common problem. Interdisciplinary programs refer to several disciplines jointly aproaching a common problem. In the interdisciplinary approach it is expected that the whole product will be greater than the sum of its contributing parts.

4. In order to develop a successful interdisciplinary program, it is essential that the exchange of information, and communication among faculty and students encourage a free flow of ideas and opinions. Should this exchange of information be threatened by professional egos and personal insecurities, communication will become insignificant. Should faculty rank and seniority produce demands for special status among faculty members, the open exchange of ideas will be reduced and probably eliminated. Because the development of interdisciplinary programs requires a genuine integration of ideas, free and open communication is a primary requirement for success in this type of approach to solving problems.

5. While it is impossible to have interdisciplinary programs without having strong disciplines, it is essential that disciplinary ambitions be subordinated to interdisciplinary efforts. From the experience of American and Canadian universities, it is apparent that most interdisciplinary efforts have failed because participation in the interdisciplinary program was considered to be secondary to the major thrust of the university. Two factors have contributed to the failure of interdisciplinary programs.

First, advancement in academic rank and the granting of tenure have been determined by disciplinary departments in the university. Consequently, faculty have been rewarded solely on their development as disciplinary scholars. While participation in interdisciplinary programs has been accepted in principle, in fact such participation is generally considered to be irrelevant to the reward system of the existing disciplinary departments. As a result, interdisciplinary participation comes at great personal risk to the faculty member.

Second, in most universities only disciplines receive a budget. The logical outgrowth of this procedure means that interdisciplinary programs depend upon the interest, support, and intellectual goodwill of the disciplinary department. While a few universities (The University of Minnesota; and Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada) have successfully generated goodwill for interdisciplinary programs, the overwhelming majority of universities have destroyed interdisciplinary programs through the lack of direct financial support. By locating budgets in existing disciplinary departments, interdisciplinary programs hang on the tenuous thread of goodwill. Except in the few cases mentioned earlier in this paragraph, most universities (via existing departments) have consequently punished these efforts through the mechanism of the faculty reward system.

6. It is especially important that the administrative structure of a university accommodate the development of interdisciplinary programs. If one of the objectives of a university is to develop interdisciplinary programs, then it is imperative that faculty be hired who are sympathetic to such programs. The preceding discussion reveals the consequence of administrative non-support of interdisciplinary programs. In addition, it is important that interdisciplinary programs receive a primary budgetary and intellectual emphasis. By receiving a budget and thereby

evolving a reward system upon an interdisciplinary basis, the interdisciplinary department can become a primary source for intellectual leadership.

In sum, it would appear that interdisciplinary programs have not fared well in American and Canadian universities. The fate of such programs has not been made on intellectual merit, rather it has been made upon the ability to survive in the politics of colleges and universities. Self-preservation of existing disciplinary units has become the primary motivating force in most colleges and universities. This is where courses are offered and this is where faculty are housed, rewarded for good work and advanced to new ranks. It is unfortunate that academic freedom does not extend to general intellectual inquiry, but as social scientists we can appreciate the dynamics of the phenomenon which we have been evaluating. To overcome the disciplinary impediment it would appear that structural changes and budgetary changes are essential in order to insure the growth and survival of interdisciplinary programs. Goodwill has been successful in a couple of cases, but those cases are too few in number to offer prescription for the future development of interdisciplinary programs. This in no way guarantees that today's innovative thrust may not twenty years hence become a conserving force, but on an incremental basis it permits a breath of fresh intellectual air to broaden the base of inquiry for today's faculty and students. Certainly, it is an improvement over the present state of higher education and a more responsible legacy for future generations.

SESSION 7:

MINORITY STUDENTS AND THE EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE

Conveners: Barbara Benavie
Alberto Nieto

ALBERTO NIETO:

A very conspicuous thing to me is that, at this workshop on minorities and experimental colleges, minorities are in the minority. If it's all right with you I'd like to pass out my extended agenda, which is more of a question item, and maybe we'd like to skip over some of them. First, I would like to explain the idea of what Chicano means. It's a political term to other people and to us it's a philosophical point of view. It's an attitude or a point of view that's been adapted, not adopted; it's been held by the poor people, campecinos in the fields, our people in the urban areas. It goes back to Pachucos in the 1940's era, but only recently has it been given credibility from an academic standpoint. But Chicanismo is the reality of the world from the standpoint of the people—the Chicano people—the Mexican-American people who find their reality in this country.

All right. Now let me challenge our black people here a little on a question. We say we believe in cultural pluralism, where we can not only practice our heritage or our cultural background on certain occasions, but live it as a daily matter and not suffer any consequences from it. Now, it's a very easy thing to cut your hair short, work on your English to get the accent out of your voice and be a hundred per cent American. And if your features aren't too bad, you know, given some help somewhere along the line, you can be accepted. But we want more than an economic share of the resources; we want what we call self-determination, and we want to maintain our own cultural values and standards. Did you two young ladies want to reply?

COMMENT:

I was thinking by the very words you used—if your nose isn't out of joint—I mean, you're accepting the negative kind of connotation of being Chicano. You see what I mean? I'm just saying that there is a parallel thing also with the black community, with good and bad values, and I don't really understand what you meant.

NIETO:

I'm sorry. I meant to say we find that tall, light complexioned, well-featured Chicanos are accepted more readily than the others.

COMMENT:

What is your whole notion of acceptance? Accepted by whom? You keep using the term "acceptance."

NIETO:

Yes . . . You're asking me to speak for myself, really. Well, you can be accepted to the point where you can be invited to parties, you can date, intermarry, you can share in the wealth, so to speak—you know, to that point; but you can't get away from the fact of who you are and that the rest of your people are pretty much passed over.

COMMENT:

Who are you talking about being accepted *by?*

NIETO:

Some of the people—Anglo people I grew up with and went to school with. Yes, I'm talking about Anglo-Americans . . . .

COMMENT:

I'm getting the impression that we're here to educate the Anglos in the room or tell him what it's like to be black or brown and I don't know which way the topic should be going. Especially as it relates to education. I don't feel really funny, but I do feel sort of awkward sitting here saying, "the black philosophy is this way" because she (a black) could take another different theme altogether.

I can sit here and everybody knows that a long time ago if you were light you got by, if you were brown you were this way, and if you were black you were that. This is already established. There are so many controversial things that are going on amongst black; amongst black against white; amongst brown—all right, here we are in this room. We're black, we're brown, we're white. The blacks and the browns and the French Canadians are a minority here. O.K., that's established. I don't think I can sit here and tell them what it's like to be black or what it's like to be this or that. Or, let's go into phases of blackness—because my philosophy is entirely different from that of the three individuals here who are black. So if we're going to start talking about minorities we should talk about the minority person *in education*, relating to the experimental colleges. And, I think, *that's* where we should start.

I can tell you a lot of things about myself and my situation in an experimental college (Johnston College) as one of 301 students and 11 black students, three young ladies and eight men. I can tell you about my experience of being in the ACTION program in the Redlands community and how the Redlands counselor told me that if I have a large Afro I'd have to cut it; or how he didn't like the jeans I had on; or that I can't work with the black students there and that I'd have to work with the white students too. I had to tell him I can't relate to them (whites). I think these are the issues we should be talking about. This is the type of situation we're in here at Johnston College. I could tell you about *that* experience.

NIETO:

Good, then, that's what we want to hear. I just want to get a little background going. Let's select from that agenda—what paragraphs you'd like to talk about.

COMMENT:

Can I raise a question? When we got that data questionnaire from the symposium, it occurred to us that, in terms of what is called "experimental college" there might well be a great deal of difference in the term. I was interested in precisely what kinds of programs are represented here. What areas are we talking about in terms of experimental colleges? We have one concept of it and it seems to be different from others I've heard.

NIETO:

Shall we go around the room and give a quick description? Anybody like to start?

COMMENT:

I'll start since I brought up the question. Our college is the only urban land grant college in the nation . . . . The population distribution of the District of Columbia is 80 per cent black and our population at the college itself is 99 per cent black. What we've done is to identify those urban populations in our district who have not been able to get a college degree. We've identified them and essentially built a college program that would take account of their social needs. For example, we have one program at the local prison which is a degree granting program. I'm working right now on a program for non-professional HEW (Health, Education and Welfare) employees at HEW . . . .

COMMENT:

I'd like to find out: Where do you go after you make up educational deficiencies? How do you respond to black students' needs? How do you respond to some sort of cultural pluralism? We're finding this hard. We don't know how.

COMMENT (City College):

Our college has open admissions; anybody with a high school diploma or the equivalent gets in. Our only concern was for space and money at the college. And in the experimental programs, again, it's money! So, we do it by lottery or first come first serve.

What we've done in experimental programs is to identify the human needs of our students. We have as an integral part of our program an intensive tutoring program. We have twenty tutors for sixty students. We call them teaching assistants—full time teaching aids. And we work with the faculty to identify students quickly—those who need tutoring preparation. We feel it's not a remedial kind of thing; it's an excellence program. We also have what we call pre-college programs—prep-school and so on—where students go before they come into the program if they feel they need some preparation. Particularly in math and English, they're given an intensive preparation so they can work efficiently. Our success rate is very high.

COMMENT (University of Southern Illinois):

O.K. The population in Washington is primarily black; the college is 99 per cent black. The rest of us are plagued by the fact that we represent a very small percentage of an institution that's gigantic and over which we have no control. We don't have a voice most of the time in policy-making decisions or what goes on in general in institutions. When minority students are affected in our institutions we don't have the support that you can get from an institution like Federal City, where you have a 99 per cent majority. We are a minority in our institution, which makes ours a different kind of problem.

COMMENT:

Recruitment is part of the answer—but it's also a problem! Sometimes it really becomes an issue that you really have to take up with the administration, who is saying, "don't bother with them" or what have you. Perhaps that's what you're talking about —commitment of that institution as to whether there will be an experimental program. To indicate the kinds of issues that come up—this includes the factor that when you're formulating experimental programs the issue will come up that this is basically a white concept. Should you go about the business of recruiting minority students? And some administrators or somebody says, "No, let's not even recruit from those people in the first place." Isn't that what I heard you say?

ALLISON JONES (Johnston College):

We're actively trying to recruit minority students, but what we're finding is the fact that minority students—blacks and browns and orientals and others—do not want to attend an experimental institution. They don't feel it's meeting their needs. I recently conducted a study with the black and Chicano students on the Johnston College and University College campuses about what the needs are of the minority students in terms of an experimental institution. How can we better meet their needs? It turns out it's sort of a vicious circle, because one thing we are not prepared to do yet is the tutoring that's really necessary to get this type of student ready, to really get him geared up to working independently, working on his own. There is a need for closer advising of the minority student according to his own needs and interests. I think this is the critical issue that we have to face.

We would like minority students in the type of programs we have; we think it is ideal for them—e.g., the fact that they would be able to work at their own pace rather than be in a lock-step program where they're expected to do things by formal schedule . . . . And yet we're finding it progressively difficult to get these students interested in experimental programs such as Johnston—I'm speaking representatively for the other experimental schools across the country with whom I recently talked in San Francisco. This is a critical problem for all of us. And your thing of limitations is not something that applies to the University of Redlands; we aren't limited to a certain number of students—there's no maximum figure.

COMMENT:

We've sort of found a solution—I don't know if it's applicable to all the other colleges but mainly because we do handle our own admissions we have been able to admit minority students who have had some previous experience. They're coming straight from high school. They have had some life experiences; they know basically what they want and any tutorial programs that they need, they have enough motivation so they can find it.

JONES:

What we run into time and time again—and we get this from black counselors from inner-city schools like Los Angeles and San Diego—is the fact that the students are conditioned to such an extent that they're looking for traditional type schools. This will enable them to get traditional jobs and then go to work in the employment field. They aren't interested in taking an extra year if that's necessary.

COMMENT:

I thought you were saying before that the likelihood was that non-white students weren't ready yet in terms of experimental schools . . . .

JONES:

No, No, I wasn't saying that. Let me correct that. I wasn't saying that— I meant in the terms of their own conditioning to the point that they aren't looking for that; they're looking for a more traditional approach.

COMMENT:

I think that is to be expected. Considering that we have been conditioned—sort of—in that the American way is the way, you know, the American four year B.A.

JONES:

The critical issue is: How can we readjust that thinking?

COMMENT:

The experiences at Federal City College are not altogether inappropriate. When the college first started about 1968, it was going to be experimental, innovative, in education. In the first year there were the usual casual courses—looking in on this and that . . . everybody sitting around on the floor in sneakers and blue jeans and going on like this. And one day I went down to the book store and saw a "Jonathan Seagull" book and wondered and wondered what the hell it was doing there. It's a very nice book but I was wondering what the hell it was doing in our school because it seemed to me our students didn't need to read about "Jonathan Seagull" to find out how rotten the schools were! And my comment at that time was, damn it, they could *write* the book if they had the skills necessary to do the writing. An interesting thing happened: The students rose up en masse and demanded three quarters of mathematics *required,* three quarters of basic English composition *required,* grades (which had not been a part of the structure at that time)—in other words, what they were saying was, we need and we want a traditional curriculum so that we can go through and get this degree and get a job!

COMMENT (Ben-Salem):

We came off with such a decision at Ben-Salem. You know, Ben-Salem continued for a number of years without any structure. The students formed various committees—and the majority of the students on the committees were the minority students—because they had the most to lose if Ben-Salem folded. And the proposal that we did come up with—what we handed to the university—was that the college become more structured.

JONES:

Essentially then, what you're saying is they really needed structure . . . .

COMMENT:

Not drastically, but some.

COMMENT:

Can I say a word? What I think is that there is a structured institution which is based in American tradition i.e., designed for white people. Now they discover there is a black population just now trying to move that way to effect transition by way of education. But this time it is very difficult for a black man to get in—or, at least, now the white people are going into non-structured situations, but the black man still has to have the transitional, the structured way before trying to handle anything else. Since the problem is the black people's need to get into this structured system—as you (the white people) are doing anyway—you must educate the minority first. The white man is failing in his duty to educate the minority. The black man is trying to make it. You need to get out of the old tradition. You have to educate the people who are trying to move up. This is the problem of the black man in America.

COMMENT (To Al Jones):

What is your goal (for the students) for experimental education? What do you say to your students that you have?

JONES:

I'd rather that Isobel (Corneil) answer that. She's on the faculty here at Johnston College.

ISOBEL CORNEIL (Johnston College):

Students do require skills for a job; without them they all sit around and become part of the problem. We need to educate people, to give them skills so that they can get a good job. I think the only difference, is a difference of attitude, where a person learns to accept responsibility for his learning. This attitude of responsibility is then carried out after you've finished four years. I want to keep in mind for you that only a small minority of white student population is in experimental colleges. It doesn't appeal to a lot of white students either. And so it's not surprising you don't have many other minorities.

COMMENT:

We (the black students) get ripped off into the traditional educational process from kindergarten. O.K.,—so do white students—but the difference is that we already know that at the end of whatever educational process we get, the competition—for whatever we're going into—is astronomical. So then when you bring a black student here and say, "Hey, here's something new; we can't really say what you're going to get out of it, but this is something for you to experiment with." He's going to look at you and say, "What the hell is wrong with you?—like, I've got to think about how I'm going to eat, I've got to have a roof over my head and clothes on my back and I'm going to take care of my family." So, when you started talking about the experimental college—that's why I asked the question: What are you going to be able to say to him?" That *this* is where we think you can go or *this* is what you'll be shooting for?

COMMENT:

I've had experience with that problem. In interviewing students I ask them about coming to Johnston College and they say: "I don't have time to experiment." And even my own parents ask me, "Is this college going to hold up? Are you going to get a job? Why don't you just go off somewhere else where they can have something planned for you and you can be something when you get out?"

COMMENT:

There are many assumptions implied: One is that people coming out of experimental colleges are going to have a worse time getting jobs than people coming out of traditional colleges. And I don't know if that assumption has been tested yet.

COMMENT:

I'm working with Morgan State UWW. We started a program in September for which we selected five out of eighty applicants. Out of eighty applicants, seventy-five were whites. I asked the director, Mrs. Craig, "Why doesn't the black man want to come into this program?" And Mrs. Craig said, "I don't know the reason why." We started to recruit and educate these people—we had to go out and persist in giving them the opportunity but still the problem is that they are fearful; they don't want to come into this program. One's duty is somehow to go back and educate them and tell them about the benefits.

COMMENT (Pomona College):

It seems to me that this discussion is backwards. We're talking about methodology and then wondering if minority students will fit the methodology. It seems to me that we ought to start with the question of what it is that minority students need from education and then design a methodology to deal with that. I just think it's silly to do it the other way around. That's what I'm here for (to deal with that question) and what I'd like to find out about . . . we have a very serious problem in Pomona: Our traditional admissions process for white students has been highly selective by the Anglo standards—SAT scores and all of that. We are now admitting 10 per cent blacks and 10 per cent Chicanos in the class—10 per cent of each. As you know, people who grow up in ghettos and go to lousy high schools tend not to have high scores by those traditional kinds of standards. We discovered, much to our chagrin, that what happens to our curriculum is highly correlated wth those scores and so a fairly large number of minority students we are admitting are having difficulty in our program. What I would like to do is change our program so that we'll help the minority students, but, I don't know what to do. And nobody in our school knows what to do and that is what I'd like help about.

COMMENT:

You said earlier that the whole educational structure was designed for white people. I wonder if perhaps this new structure of the experimental program doesn't share precisely that characteristic: being designed for white middle class students? Now, let me double back. I've been taking a good hard look at education and discovering essentially what it is that we do learn when we go to school. And essentially what we learn is to manipulate the symbols of this culture to our best advantage, whatever that is. We all learned, when we went to college, how to talk, how to manipulate words . . . . Now let me ask: What do minority students need? It seems to me that minority students need some education about the same kinds of techniques in manipulating. And another aspect, of course, is the kind of value structure too;

that is, manipulation for what? But the vital thing is the "nuts and bolts" of identifying and providing those kinds of manipulative skills. Design your structure to the needs of people, yes; but it seems to me that you should design a structure to include getting those skills.

COMMENT (Maynard College):

First of all, I think there's a tremendous diversity in that domain called "experimental college." And two, I don't think that the Anglo origins of most of them necessarily preclude the possibility that some of them might be very useful to the educational framework of the non-Anglos in this country. What seems to be the issue is one we all have to deal with in an everyday sort of way. In trying to work with people in education we always have the question of assessment, determining deficiency, and all that has to do with the objectives you have as a program or as a society. And it seems to me that if you open up to the prospect that there are a multitude of objectives that can be allowed for in an educational program, then the question of deficiencies—the question of whether a person came from a lousy high school—is not as important as graduating to the kind of future he wants to plan for himself. You have different kinds of people with different objectives, and as an institution you have to allow for those differences in objectives. In some ways that's the crux of an educational program and certainly an experimental program. So I would think the response to the Pomona dilemma, on what to do, is simply: You have to start with the people who are there and ask them what they want to do, forget about trying to change the curriculum.

COMMENT:

How can you get the institution to provide the kinds of support and services for these students that are needed?

COMMENT:

Well, first it's a question of commitment and the next question is what you do once you have the commitment.

COMMENT:

I'm wondering, when you talk about looking at what the needs are—are we bringing to them the kinds of programs they can use? Are we giving them the kinds of programs that they can deal with? That makes a difference.

COMMENT:

When you talk about experimenting to a black student, he's probably going to ask you who you're going to experiment with. "What are you going to do with me?" Then you're going to begin to reject him because it's *your* institution, not his; he has no interest in it; he has no way of feeling that his needs are going to be made known. So when he decides, O.K. something isn't coming across right, the response is, you know, it's his fault that he didn't learn. He is "deficient." And I wonder how many of *us* are deficient in that we have not set the situation or environment up properly? We have not made it such that he can really learn.

COMMENT (Aslan):

Our school is experimental, very much like Antioch West, except that it's owned by Chicanos—by students and faculty and community. Now the first thing we found out was that students who were doing well in the established institutions were not about to take a chance on our institution no matter how much they believed in it and no matter how much they had worked for it. Second, the students we have there are all dropouts. They're either from high school or from college. Some were in college but weren't happy there—weren't going to stay—so in a sense, they're dropouts. They come to us not for a job, because we are not stressing jobs. You don't come to Aslan to get a big fat job. You come to Aslan to learn techniques to help your people. Our purpose is social change. The objective that we're training our students for is to be agents of change. Now within that requirement, within that objective, we still have the objective of some manipulative skills and we recognize the importance of employability. We feel that we have to train these people in these fields if they're to be agents of change as well as to be employable.

The manner in which we do this is what we call a "totally relevant" manner. (We're not sure if we're successful because we've only been at it for three months; so let me qualify it there). Our students put out a newspaper. It's not a newspaper for our student body because there are only forty-five students in our student body. It's a newspaper to the community. They're having to learn how to not only get their ideas down in English, but they're also having to translate them into Spanish and they insist that their paper be bilingual and most of them aren't so hot in Spanish. They're not so hot in English either for that matter, you know. And within this context, then, we begin our tutorial program of working over the person's article. In fact we really begin with what he means to achieve by writing this article—what is his educational purpose, etc.?

We also have three broadcast programs going steady, two on radio and one on TV each week. Each group of students has a project they're doing in the community. When their turn comes to go on the air they have to prepare themselves to tell the community what they are doing. These programs are in Spanish. So they have to spell out in English what their objectives are and what they're going to do; then they translate it into Spanish; then they record it on a tape recorder; and then they go to the radio station where their program is recorded and played back to them later on. I'm not sure this is going to work because the problem is these manipulative skills we've been discussing and we're demanding it in both languages.

COMMENT:

Could you talk a little bit more about your notion of social change? What kinds of programs, what kinds of specific goals you've got, and how the programs get implemented—that would be very interesting to us.

COMMENT:

I can tell you one thing—a little bit of our philosophy. We believe that the system is composed of a series of institutions that are built into our minds—into our Chicano minds as well as everybody else's. You don't confront the police, you deal with this institution—is it serving its purpose, if not, how do you change it? And generally we're talking about using one institution to change another—to work one institution on another. This is where we're aiming at. This is not where our students are. They were selected on the basis of their commitment to the community by personal interview. They were already into projects and some of them are continuing these projects. We're very sensitive to students starting a project and not finishing it. And we want to get the idea into their minds that if they're going to start something, they're going all the way through and finish it. Some of these projects include work on the reform of the methadone clinic, which is sort of touchy. Another project involves establishing people control of a health clinic in a rural community; another one involves establishing a clinic itself in a community. A third project is trying to capture control of a school board and city council in a little town that's 80-82 per cent Chicano.

COMMENT:

Can I ask you a question? Do I understand you saying that all of your students are Chicano?

COMMENT:

Except in our master's program.

COMMENT:

Well, what about your faculty?

COMMENT:

In our master's program, we require students—some of whom are not Chicano—to take part of the teaching load. Otherwise our faculty is all Chicano.

COMMENT:

What I see here is that you are not discussing the problem of the minority. You are just arguing now. You are not discussing *racism*, as it relates to some concepts of education. We came here to discuss the problem of why the minority doesn't get into this new system. Is that what you're discussing?—Why the black man does not accept this program—the Open University—why the Chicano does not accept this new program? It's good that you've already set up an institution for the Mexicans. How are they going to relate to the other white people who are interested in the minority? How can we create a new open university which the minorities will accept? Do they stay away because they don't have enough money or funds? Is it because they don't have enough of an IQ? These are the basic issues to be discussed.

COMMENT:

My personal opinion is that the traditional educational system as institutionalized in the minds of the minority, as well as the majority, is miseducation. It should be dismantled into schools like Antioch West, or like our school. That's the way-out position and unless you're all ready to accept that, then you'll have to continue to deal with the problem as we find it . . . .

COMMENT:

What we are trying to do at Morgan State is to educate the minorities: that there's another way to get a B.A. or a degree. I think the concept of Antioch College, the concept of UWW, is to educate both classes—both white and minorities—that they have the same opportunity for an equitable education. The problem we are now discussing is how it is that a black man gets into this opportunity. Is it a matter of money? Is it because they can't get into this institution? Because of IQ? Antioch College is not setting up a separate university for everybody—because it's a university for everybody—an open university.

COMMENT (UWW):

I think you have to educate them. We have to go out and disseminate this concept of Antioch's open university. (I've been doing this for the past three, four years). They go out and educate people about their program. But if you have a university in the heart of the Chicanos, and say: "This is for the Mexicans," they are not going to educate the others because your sights are set for the Mexicans. But Antioch is ours, all ours. Antioch is out to educate everybody! We have the opportunity to educate them, to go out and tell them there is another way to get their degree. There are job opportunities for them if they come in.

COMMENT:

Are we partly talking about changing the public image of the experimental college? Making it more acceptable?

COMMENT:

You know, The University of Michigan was experimental a hundred years ago; the idea of educating the masses was a crazy idea. Now that's awfully respectable. There is a question I can't help raising when I look, for example, at the students enrolled in our program who are thirty-five year old women who head households. And I ask, "Would you like to go to an experimental school with experimental programs and work on independent study projects?" Perhaps they need education—and they're not sure that's education. But also, what's going to happen when they get through with four years of that kind of program? Or when they say, O.K., now I have my A.B. degree and I want to get promoted or I want a job doing this or that—and they won't be able to get that job?

I have a specific goal in working with this program at HEW. Within ten years I want to place all my students in top bureaucratic positions of HEW and change that whole goddamn place! So that it begins to serve human beings and not the bureaucrats who serve them. That means the students have got to be prepared to talk the Man's language, for one thing. I can go into a meeting of bureaucrats and start talking street talk and get nothing; and I can go and start talking about optimum feasibility and bullshit like that and they'll listen. You have to know the language.

COMMENT:

Yes, this is true. Just as the experimental colleges have to be accredited, people have to learn the Man's language; and it's not going to be a very easy task for us to do. But if we succeed—if we put trained students into the community to perform in the community, to talk the Man's language, we build credibility for our college—for our style of college. By the way, our college is flexible to the point where we could have a black unit or a French-Canadian unit, if there were these people in our area.

COMMENT:

I have a comment to make. I just noticed that only the same people are talking. They all are basically agreeing with each other and there aren't any comments from anybody else. Have we really resolved the problem of experimental colleges and minorities?

COMMENT:

Before you came in, one problem that came up was teaching communication skills, or manipulative skills—reading, writing, speaking, math—to minority students; some of us would like to hear how it's handled at your school.

COMMENT:

In my school, the students still have to take the general studies requirements at Western, the parent institution. We have a system in which we give credits to our students for tutoring those who need academic assistance. The problem is not really very great—and I don't know why we *don't* have a crisis—but we try to place the students (blacks or Chicanos) who have difficulties with their peers, their cultural and racial peers. Those problems are important for us Chicanos as well as for Indians and for blacks.

We believe that education as a concept should be *effective* first. For example, we have blacks who are prepared to work wth blacks, particularly where a student is in a delicate position. Let's say he's confused; he simply doesn't know how to finish a certain course in math. We will commonly recruit the services of any who can help us get to that person. And clearly not just for effective teaching. It goes beyond teaching. We always have a black right there, working *with* this expert. And it works.

COMMENT:

It seems to me that we have all been programmed—blacks, browns, and whites alike—to believe that the essence of education is that you go sit in a room two hours a day every day and after four years of this you'll be ready to take a place in society. This has been drummed into blacks so much that it's the only type of learning they think there is. Anything experimental can't fit. . . .

COMMENT:

I think we're confusing, mixing two things. One is the purpose that we want, that our students want, for education. Second, is the method that we're going to use. And we keep saying "experimental." I'm sort of bored by the word experimental already. I've been here only a little while, but we keep talking about experimenting and then people equate that with going out in the community. But I don't see why or how they would have to be the same thing. It seems to me that social action is only one of many possible legitimate goals. And we talk about "social action and experimentation." I'd like to see us expand it. My own guess, and it's only an impression, is that most students of *all* colors, particularly if they are of low income backgrounds, would like to make it in the mainstream world. They would like individual education and they certainly would like to have social consciousness too.

COMMENT:

There are lots of things in traditional education that are great, and social action is only one part. What I'm mainly interested in is helping people who have come from deprived backgrounds be able to accomplish those goals. I don't know how to do it, but that's what I'm interested in.

COMMENT:

The more I hear about this so-called experimental education, the more I become uneasy. For myself, as a Chicano, the concept of experimental education as merely some kind of innovative education is irrelevant. What we want is progressive education according to our own definition. There's another problem of course, that of handling the attitudes of those who purportedly want to work with experimental education: The problem of the minority and credibility. The white man still treats our ideas and our proposals as illegitimate ideas or concepts, something that is less than good or respectable because it happens to come from people who have been despised in the past. But I believe in what I'm doing now, in our own type of experimental education—that it is legitimate, is respectable, and is leading the student into the same direction of progress and success that he would want had he gone into a traditional program. But we want to do our homework; we want our students to remember the past and avoid the pitfalls. That's why I'm saying the students in my college will have certain courses in Chicano studies before they go to, say, Washington State College to major in psychology.

COMMENT:

This is far afield from your comment, but applies to your new college too. I think one of the most crucial things for any student, particularly in his first year in a new institution, is to develop confidence in his own academic abilities to handle the courses and to learn competence in the skills and with his studies. He needs to have confidence in his academic abilities. And whether or not a person develops that confidence in his first year, I think, is going to depend in very large measure on the kind of support he gets from faculty members and from other students. One of the things that many colleges and universities do that doesn't help the situation for the freshmen is to put their major program resources into the junior and senior years. So that, that's where you have the small classes, close relationships with the faculty, etc. And in the freshman and sophomore years you're dealt with in these large lectures and you don't know what the man is talking about in the far end of the room with his back towards you and mumbling on the blackboard and you don't see him and he doesn't know you; he never learns your name. I think if the college would turn that upside down and put the real support into the freshman year, that would make a large difference whether the student develops his confidence.

It's not just a matter of how good a high school, or how bad a high school he comes from, it seems to me; it's largely a matter of his psychological frame of mind whether he has the confidence that he can do the basic skills we've been discussing.

COMMENT:

I don't think we've said much about what can happen that's important, in spite of the shortcomings of institutions—like the Negro colleges. My first year of teaching was at Tuskegee Institute, teaching Western Civilization. As I look back on it, there's nothing so paradoxical as teaching about Greeks and Romans to kids who had never been on a railroad, had never seen an airport, had lived in the backwoods all their lives. There were things in history that were good—they got so turned on—the questions that arose were so exciting to deal with, that I began to see that, really, many of these traditional institutional disciplines were well loved. It was a way of expanding people's possibilities. Now, if the Negro colleges did that, and only that—it wasn't bad.

COMMENT:

From my own experience I see two divisions, right off. You have the faculty, who are not from the same community. They are most likely from the bourgeoise class. Then you have the young blacks, the street people, those who live in the ghettos. Right there you have a division of people and of standards and of values; so how can that faculty teach relevance or how can they teach adequately when they are not capable of knowing who they are teaching?

COMMENT:

That's what you call an education in the broader sense. Not all education comes from books. There's learning taking place in that situation too. Let me clarify that. The point I want to make is that there is room, and a need, for diversity in education.

There's room for different schools to exist—for different purposes, different curriculum—so that students who are attracted to what different schools offer ought to be able to go to them and we shouldn't insist on finding a paradigm. We're not going to find one. Different people have different needs, and at the same time.

The second point I want to make is that I don't think that students should expect to come into a school that's an ongoing institution and say, "Hey, I would really rather this school be A than B, so switch your school and be A." At the same time, I agree with something I think you're saying: that faculties and colleges ought to be very sensitive to the needs of the students they have. O.K.? And try to reach out and communicate with people.

NIETO:

I want to change the subject back to experimental schools and the minority. I would suggest that the Anglo institutions set up a branch, such as Johnston College—maybe just a two-year college—with teachers of that minority teaching, recruiting, and establishing the tutorial system. This could be done within the same kind of experimental context as Johnston. Then maybe after the third year they could transfer over to the regular system. Could that be a solution that might work regarding the problem you were talking about earlier?

COMMENT:

Why can't they go for four years to the experimental or the alternative models?

NIETO:

No, two years would be better. It would be a place to start out. They might be able to go all the way, but it should start with just the first two years. You might have your regular Johnston College black for two years, then brown for two years, with complete ethnic staff. And then at the end of that period swing into the regular Johnston College program, or maybe go to a traditional system. But at least start at that point.

3

COMMENT:

Is it a question then, of the schools adjusting to the minority students instead of trying to make the minority students fit the mold that educators or society makes for them—must the schools try to meet the students and provide for them what they need?

NIETO:

In our case we have to meet them where they're at; we're designed that way. But we also have our purpose, our aim in mind which they learn about. It is made very clear to them in an admission interview that they're going to school for the purpose of serving the community and not for the purpose of employment.

COMMENT:

So then you can't say that any one program is any better than any other because there are different programs and they're all programs that are needed.

NIETO:

That seems to be something we agree on: that there should be a diversity of programs. Why shouldn't there be middle-class Negro schools, so that a black student could have a choice of going to the middle-class Negro school or a black school?—a black from the ghetto could have a choice of going to where there are some black revolutionaries teaching Malcolm X and revolution, or take a chance at the black middle-class school or an Anglo school. I think we at least agree that there should be a diversity of alternatives.

SESSION: 8

OFF-CAMPUS EDUCATION

Conveners: **Bernard Fisken**
Gale Fuller
Hugh Haggard
Cricket Levering
John Valley

CRICKET LEVERING (Southern Illinois University):

I am in charge of a field internship program for graduate students in Community Development at Southern Illinois University. It is an *internship* program as opposed to the more familiar (here) undergraduate cross-cultural experience. Therefore, rather than describing my program, I shall propose an agenda for this discussion.

First, I feel that there is a need for exchange of information about field study opportunities, so that people who are planning an off-campus experience are not limited to the opportunities in their own immediate geographic area. Second, we ought to find an effective mechanism for sharing our various models of field study. Several such models of field study are being used in a multitude of colleges and universities; the comparative merits, successes, and failures of these models would be useful information to many of us. Third, our methods of evaluating performance in field study need to be collectively examined and compared.

JOHN VALLEY (Educational Testing Service, New Jersey):

My general responsibility at ETS includes the College-Level Examination Program which is sponsored by the College Entrance Examination Board. This program is intended to provide recognition for the learning experiences of thousands of people who are not or have not been in college. Many of these people have had experiences that would be comparable to those you are trying to provide in various off-campus study programs.

Also, by virtue of special staff assignments, I have had the opportunity to study external degree programs—both planned and operational. One generalization I would offer at this time is that if the variety of models of external degree programs were more widely known, perhaps the potential of this concept might be more effectively utilized by higher education.

GALE FULLER (Westminster College):

I am the chairman of the experimental division of Westminster College and my special responsibility is for the University Without Walls program. The UWW concept is to provide an alternative college level experience, not necessarily for the typical-age college student. We are trying to design and build alternative approaches to education for people from sixteen to sixty, who are trying to meet their need for continuing experience.

One major question that has been raised since the beginning of the program has to do with the validity of the program as opposed to a more conventional school. What does a degree mean? What does an A, B, or C in History 101 mean? Although we don't know the answers, we react quite strongly when some alternative is suggested. Some people can afford to pass up a degree and ignore these questions, but most people find a degree useful. And there are also people seeking things like teacher's credentials and then the questions must be answered to these outside agencies' satisfaction. Thus there is pressure placed on experimental projects that the academic community, much less the individuals involved, have no control over. The control over these accrediting agencies lies in the government and so maybe we should start looking to the legislature to put pressure on them (outside agencies) to approve us.

What is the meaning of a bachelor's degree? Are the BS, the BA, and BFA all the same thing? What level of work should count as credit towards a bachelor's degree? Should credit be given for skills, such as auto mechanics? These questions have not been answered and are critical to what we are doing.

BERNARD FISKEN (Johnston College):

I am the director of the off-campus programs at Johnston College. Johnston is on the contract system, where a student specifies before he begins a course what his objectives and evaluative standards are. This flexible system lends itself very well to off-campus study.

There are four time parameters that students there work under in these programs. The *Plunge* is a one to three day experience. It is usually not tied in academically, but is intended to be a brief exposure to something that the student is interested in. An *Internship* lasts for a semester, and usually involves one day a week of a student's time. It is usually taken in conjunction with a course, as a supplement. It is especially interesting in that it makes vocational testing available to everyone in the college, especially underclassmen who are still deciding major aeras of study concentration. The *Interim* is a four-week period between the Fall and Spring semesters. It is an excellent time period for a short, intensive cross-cultural experience. Many people do take advantage of it too; usually three-fourths of the student body is away from campus during Interim. Examples of cross-cultural programs are Community Insight* and Organizational Insight programs. These involve full time involvement in a culture other than the student's own. Semester—and year-long—off-campus programs are arranged by the student through an off-campus advisory board. There are pre-arranged programs available, such as ACTION; but otherwise this board decides on tuition, whether it is a full semester's or year's work, and whether the evaluative methods are adequate. I am personally very much in favor of semester and year long experiences because of increasing encounters with the "community-raped" model. This occurs when a student spends a lot of time in a community, talking to people, taking the time of community and organizational people, and learns a lot, while the community gets little or nothing in return. If off-campus study programs are longer than a few weeks, then students are able to return something and then they both benefit.

---

* See Session 9, p. 202.

HUGH HAGGARD (Thomas Jefferson College):

I am the head of Off-Campus Study at Thomas Jefferson College. Experimental education as we're doing it is attempting to perfect experiences and opportunities where the values of the professional educator are related to the values of the person on the street. Heretofore we've kept the community and the university a respectable distance apart. Off-campus programs, especially University Year for Action, involve students and communities in very real ways: there are high learning pay-offs for both that are not strictly academic and theoretical. Communication and interaction is the way that experimental higher education can make sense in the minds of legislators and average citizens who are thinking of riots and protest movements and are currently suspicious of us. Such communication is the way we can continue their respect for higher education.

Off-campus programs at TJC are arranged around a ten week/fifteen hour quarter time period. There are intensive research projects where a student locates materials he wants to study and goes and does his research. There are also academic exchange, intercultural, and social service programs.

For people planning these kinds of experiences, we keep a file of descriptions of all these kinds of experiences, so that a student can find out if someone has had a similar experience and has any advice or contacts.

ISOBEL CORNEIL (Johnston College):

Regarding the UWW, I've been to Berkeley and talked with some of the students there and there are certain things I haven't quite been able to figure out. Where do the students go for resource information? Who do they pay tuition to, and approximately how much do they pay?

FULLER:

There are three project co-directors involved there. One of them is a philosopher, one a sociologist, and the other a recent graduate of the UWW Ph.D. program. They help the individual students develop the resources that they need. If they don't have them at their fingertips, they work in the community with the student until the resources are available. Of course, in the Berkeley area the resources are almost unlimited.

CORNEIL:

An ex-Johnston student came to me and he wants to go to Berkeley to learn nutrition. Where is he going to go? I'm not sure that the UC Berkeley professors will spare the time to give him information, so where is he going to get it?

FULLER:

He would go to the staff members there and they would be the ones to help him find somebody in one of the institutions around there, or one of the hospitals or whatever. That's the big part of their job.

HAGGARD:

Are there funds to pay the resources?

FULLER:

Let me talk about tuition. It is a self-sustaining community there, so they pay their tuition to the project rather than to or through (in the case of a student of mine) Westminster College. They pay the school $50 a semester for record keeping. All other funds are used by the community right there in whatever way they deem necessary. That includes the salaries of the staff members. The funds for a resource person would come out of the same kitty. The cost in terms of tuition at this point is going to come out to $2000 to $2500 a head.

COMMENT:

How many students are involved in this program?

FULLER:

We have rolling admissions where a student can begin anytime during the year instead of just September or January. So students come and go—there are twenty-four students currently involved (at Berkeley).

COMMENT:

You were expressing your uncertainty about what degrees and grades and credits were before, and I was wondering why you're bothering to go on with your program without considering these things. You're taking them for granted.

FULLER:

We do it because we see it as an experiment in higher education, and until we do the experiment we won't know what the results will be. I think the feeling is certainly prevalent that we need some alternatives, when we don't exactly have any. The only way to find out what they are is to get involved in something and see how it goes.

COMMENT:

I really don't see the alternative here. Is it being outside of a regular institution as far as courses go? It's still hooked up to a degree thing and there's a Ph.D. program and credits and stuff like that.

FULLER:

The alternative is in the style of learning and the resources drawn upon, in moving about the community rather than going to class three times a week at a set time. Each person can design his or her own modes of learning—whatever suits them best.

DON SCHWARTZ (Pitzer College):

I have a question that troubles me very much. In this experimental higher education, this experiment in off-campus learning, what outcome do we have in mind? I'm not sure what we're trying to substitute for what has been called traditional education. What kind of learning outcome do you anticipate or hope for that would be better than the learning outcome in a conventional liberal arts undergraduate college?

VALLEY:

The College Level Examination Program (CLEP) rests on the assumption that through a wide variety of off-campus learning experiences people can acquire traditional forms of education.

COMMENT:

That assumes that there is something worthwhile in what has been called higher education. As soon as people are on the outside of that, but have somehow picked up what is acquired in the system through other means, you give these people the opportunity to show they can do the same things.

COMMENT:

It also assumes that a testing service can make money from an equivalency degree.

COMMENT:

Forgetting about motivation, I'm trying to figure out what the logic of all this is. We have students coming to a college that we advertise as a place for students to come to. They come to us and we send them "out there" because it's really better to learn out there.

GREG McALLISTER (Lone Mountain College):

I think we're really in a bind on this whole rap and we always will be until. . . I think it's like a kid growing up with parents and at some point the parents get turned on liberal and decide they want to get the kid exposed to the world instead of the family. So the mother and the father bring them out of the house and hold their hand as they walk through the community. And that's about as far as we go while calling ourselves higher education. We have to take a radical jump beyond that and stop calling ourselves higher education, stop thinking of ourselves as educators, and think of ourselves as human beings in the world. Students have to go through this process of getting out of the parent-child relationship with the school, and that's painful. The most a school can do is get them to a point where they leave school—then they are managing on their own two feet and then maybe they can function in a democratic society. I think only about one-tenth of one per cent of the people in this society have ever outgrown the parent-child relationship—*especially* people in academia.

FRAN MACY (Ex-Peace Corps):

For years I've worked with graduates of your institutions, putting them in jobs overseas—jobs where they have been requested to "come and produce." I have a kind of response to your question. . . . So many volunteers have said "I've been examined and examined and examined on what I know, but I've never been tested as a human being. *That's* why I'm here and that's why I take very seriously the expectation that I produce something." This goes back to your point about the parental relationship; but we are not testing enough of the total individual unless we put them outside the institutions. I respect people who want this test earlier than they have traditionally been getting it.

FRANK DOBBINS (Community Development Foundation):

Did you (Don Schwartz) get an answer to your question? If not, would "effective performance", the ability to perform a task effectively in a real life situation, be suitable?

SCHWARTZ:

I can understand performance goals and testing the human being. My concern is about the attachment of off-campus experiences to something called higher education in institutions that have certain kinds of expertise—that have nothing to do with these experiences.

FULLER:

I get turned off by the use of the term "higher education."

Higher than what? Higher than high school? Most of our high schools aren't very hot and most of our colleges and universities aren't very hot. So I don't want to talk within this context. I want to talk within the context of education, period. Education to me means the development of a human being in terms of understanding and insights and knowledge and in terms of his own personality and his own being. This simply canot be done in a classroom in a theoretical context. Off-campus education is therefore an integral part of the growth that a person must go through to be ready for whatever he wants to do at the time of graduation. People who are exclusively sitting in classrooms and are filled full of theory and play their higher education game aren't ready for a damned thing.

COMMENT:

We started an internship program at Raymond College. It's not required. It's available to those who feel that their own education, their own personal growth can be enhanced by this kind of experience. The program can be the equivalent of one course to a semester and beyond, and can be taken in a large variety of settings. We have students all over the US, in Canada, Latin America, Mexico, and Europe, too. The requirements vary and are essentially set by the students themselves. The evaluations are done by the students in terms of what they get out of it.

We've had students as research assistants, sub-professional interns in hospitals, legal assistants, political workers, bank workers, advertising agency employees, and employees in various Federal programs. We'll develop any kind of internship the students want by simply talking to people. We've not once been turned down. This is the kind of thing that we feel is really giving our students fantastic experience.

COMMENT:

I think we should look at this in historical perspective. It wasn't very long ago that nearly 95 per cent of the population lived in an agrarian society on farms and ranches. People went to college then to prepare to be a minister, a physician, or a lawyer, when each one of these careers required specific kinds of information.

And the place to get that was at a college where people were trained to transmit that kind of information. In a relatively short time the whole scene has changed. Now 95 per cent of our total population lives in urban and suburban areas.

As a part of this complex social development, we are now aware that people can learn things in many different situations. They don't have to go enroll in a residential college. Our whole society is full of resources and opportunities for learning, and students can learn in these other situations as well as they can in the traditional college environment.

COMMENT:

One of the biggest things that you are all ignoring in your planning is the fact that you're going out and taking from the community you're going to, while they can't take advantage of your (campus) resources. You've got to enter into some kind of sharing arrangement. . . . It's only fair. Even at the community college level higher education has to provide more of an open resource to the community they're ripping off.

FULLER:

We have one feeble attempt to meet this problem in our internship program at a state hospital in our community. Anyone in the departments of that institution is free to take anything at our college that they feel is of value to them. We also have an exchange arrangement for one person per semester to spend equivalent time in the other institution. In psychology, for example, a faculty member will spend part of his time as a therapist or facilitator at the institution and someone at the institution will assume a teaching role at the college.

LARRY MAGID:

I think the reason that people in this room aren't concerned with what higher education can relate to these life experiences is that most people here are one way or another involved in the big business of higher education. It's not only a big business, but it violates virtually all anti-trust laws in that, not only is it itself controlled by a few elite, non-governmental accrediting agencies, but the education business is the sole sanctioning institution for the society when it comes to status and money and good jobs. The university has taken on super-governmental functions that way. It's taken on god-like characteristics. As long as the universities maintain that kind of status in society then, by God, if somebody wants to get out of the ghetto, wants to do anything to get a certain status in this particular society, then they have to relate to this monolithic structure which we call higher education. One of the questions we have to start asking ourselves is how we can go about de-mythologizing higher education and creating a kind of situation where the access to money, status, position, equality, dignity, justice, and effectiveness can be gotten without the institution. That is a very complex question that could take us beyond this conference. We're talking about *everything*, including the redistribution of wealth.

The question we have to ask ourselves when we talk about higher education, especially experimental higher education, is not simply what particular structure we can use to accomplish essentially the same goals which education is now trying to accomplish. We can talk about innovation in the same way that American Airlines talks about the piano bar in its 747. It's just another means to the same end, it's a technical matter. It is significant, but of limited interest and should not be seen in grandiose terms. Now, what I think we need to start to do—and what I haven't heard addressed anywhere by this conference—is the whole question of values and goals in politics, if I may use such a scary word in education. Looking back on the educational alternative movement, which is now entering it's second decade, we really have to ask ourselves: what did we do to really talk about the goals, the values, the politics of both education and society? What have we done to make education a more liberating institution, a more liberating environment? What has education as a business done towards the end of racism? What has the education business done to develop some kind of community control over education? These are the key questions and they really go beyond whether we're talking about 20 students in Berkeley or 15 some place else.

Also, when we talk about community, I think we have to define community. If you're talking about governmental agencies, multinational corporations—no matter how progressive they may be—or other agencies and institutions which are essentially controlled by the top strata of American society, then I don't think you're really talking about change. The universities have traditionally been in the business of serving the needs of that strata. So, if we're really talking about community, we have to really be able to define community and what a real community group is.

COMMENT:

I'd like to bring up again the question of what the value is of off-campus study in experimental education.

COMMENT:

The traditional educational outcome is perfecting cognitive ability to think, to reason, to examine, to analyze; off-campus study provides the opportunity for cognitive *and* affective kinds of experience. It exists in experimental education to prepare people to help other people; and to learn how to do things as well as to learn how to think; but most importantly to synthesize all three.

FISKEN:

I want to comment on being effective. It bothers me that you could define it in purely structural or technical terms. Then we could go look at the trade schools that I think are very effective. I know of a school that can teach you very effectively how to be a computer operator or programmer in a short period of time and for much less money than it costs to educate someone in a liberal arts college. I guess the question I have is: to be effective for what? And is that also the goal of experimental education—to help define what it is that people are trying to be effective for?

COMMENT:

I think the individual should decide that, not the institution.

FISKEN:

If you take someone out of a traditional high school and put him in a value-free experimental college, then the only values he has are the ones he picked up from his parents or accidentally got elsewhere. I for one consider myself opposed to the dominant values of our culture, but I cannot change them. As far as values go in experimental colleges, they (the schools) degenerate either into a playground, or center around the occult or religion courses—that I don't object to, but that don't seem to have any particular thrust to them—or they become essentially new structures to teach the old values. To say that it's up to the individual is really a cop-out, because colleges don't seem to provide the kind of education needed. If we lived in a value-free society or a society with progressive values, then I would accept that; but I don't think we live in that kind of society.

COMMENT:

I wonder if you could explain what you mean by value-free and progressive value?

FISKEN:

Traditional values are things like competitiveness, militarism, racism, sexism, striving to get ahead. These things are pushed all the way through education, from kindergarten to grad school. Now, you're value-free in an institution which essentially accepts the fact or presumes that there are no values that we teach—that we are neutral—to study what you will, to bounce around, everything is cool, everything is fine, you smile a lot. Concerning progressive values, I think it's about time that the experimental education movement sat down and said here are some things that need to be changed in this society. Things like community control, consumer protection agencies, ecology, whatever. One of the things we should be offering students right now is a program that says here are a series of values, a series of goals, here is a program to help you develop these goals.

COMMENT:

You can see the university or college taking the role of prophet or social critic rather than the role it's now taking where it encourages students themselves to question and analyze prevailing values?

FISKEN:

I think that's pretentious, but I do think that the academic community can begin to set for itself certain kinds of goals and values—one of which is questioning, one of which is old time dialogue. I think it would be perfectly legitimate for a university to be a social organizer.

HOWARD (New College):

It seems that what you want is ideological colleges; not that all colleges have the same ideology, but that each college have one. I'm talking about schools that have selected certain values that they are opposed to and that they want to work against, such as those values you cited.

FISKEN:

How long they would last would depend on the community and what they were doing. Now if they were providing a food cooperative with cheap or free food for the community or child care centers, then the chances might be good.

HOWARD:

A & P wouldn't like that.

FISKEN:

You'd have a hell of a lot of people who might not like your ideology, but they sure would like your food. And God knows that it would be a better use of a student's time to learn child care than the things they normally do.

HOWARD:

Would you go so far as supporting political candidates?

FISKEN:

First, that's against the tax-exempt status of the university—that's reality. Second, I'm talking about service, not political leadership, but service to the people.

COMMENT:

One point that hasn't been made concerns VISTA, where a significant proportion of the 4,000 volunteers have become radicalized. It's come home to them how much of America there is and how much they don't know about it. They also find out about how vast the services are that this country pays so dearly for and how ineffective they are for the people that need them. Before long they're going to be back. They will start reawakening people back on campus. That institution isn't going to remain the same.

JIM DOXSEY (Educational Service, Salt Lake City):

Not to change the subject. . . I'd like to raise a question about evaluation. Is there some valid evaluation process that has to do with learning that should take place? How can learning be maximized?

COMMENT:

My job is helping certify credits from off-campus work. To me the whole problem becomes one of debriefing. You ask a student to keep a log and hope he sends you monthly reports. From these you can find out what's troubling him so you can talk to him when he gets back. What were the critical problems? What did you do about them? What methods did you use to solve them? What were the critical decisions? What values were you invoking? Sometimes they're not aware of what they're doing—you work to get them to see this. You gradually help the student to see what he has learned and in this process he is learning a great deal about learning how to learn. And before long he is capable of doing this himself.

COMMENT:

I think the off-campus study is extremely worthwhile. I think it's about time we moved into something like this on a large scale because we have a tendency to hole up on our campuses and develop worlds of our own. This session has helped, it seems to me, to point up the value of off-campus study in bringing some reality, some relevance, into the classroom.

SESSION 9:

COMMUNITY INSIGHT: A NEW DIRECTION IN EDUCATION*

Conveners: **Roger Baty**
Alan Joplin

NEITHA BEAL (Community Insight Coordinator for Victorville):

At most colleges and universities students live in an isolated, unreal world. They have little contact with the outside world or even the local community. Contact with people who have life styles that are different from their own is almost nonexistent and is rarely if ever emphasized as an integrated part of their total college education. The students may learn something about the world outside through their studies and readings in courses that are supposed to be teaching them these things like anthropology and sociology, but the real and sometimes formidable experience of actually having to live and deal with quite a different culture is lacking from their college experience. Community Insight is meant to fill the gap by giving them a cross-cultural experience in depth.

ROGER BATY (Johnston College):

When we founded Johnston College it was assumed that an ability to communicate across cultural barriers should be expected of all the graduates of the college. To this end, Community Insight—a cross-cultural home-stay experience—was created during the fall of 1969, the first year of the college's existence. To date, forty-four Johnston students have been placed with black, white, Mexican-American, Oriental, and native American families in thirteen different communities in California, Utah, New Mexico and Arizona.

---

* The original tape of the session was not usable. Hence this summary is based on the work done in preparation for the symposium, notes taken during the meeting, and a transcription of a later session which was held for students and faculty interested in the program. This version is, therefore, an amalgamation of several sessions but the essence of each session is contained herein.

The program has involved three staff members from Johnston College, assisted by a total of four Johnston Community Development Trainees. However, it should be noted that the program would be impossible were it not for the volunteer community coordinators in each of the participating communities who have served as staff members in many ways. The community coordinators have helped make initial contacts with agencies and organizations in the participating communities and have helped through the planning period through attendance at conferences, meetings and workshops both on campus and in the communities. We are very fortunate to have with us at this session Mrs. Neitha Beal who has been one of the real guiding lights behind Community Insight. Her enthusiasm and ability to make things happen have done much to bring the ideas we had back in 1969 to fruition.

BEAL:

As Roger said, Community Insight is a cross-cultural homestay which takes place in homes and communities. It is a program where a student can live with a family which is different from his own past experiences. When I say different, I mean, a family which differs ethnically, culturally and economically. Community Insight is community oriented because the students work as volunteers in the community while living with their family. For example, in Victorville there have been students who have worked at Head Start, Day Care ESEA-Title I schools, Operation Contact with the Dependency Prevention Commission and other places.

ALAN JOPLIN (Johnston College):

My job has been to help coordinate Community Insight from the college end this interim (1971) and Victorville is one of the communities I would say is a model. We have had students living in Pasadena, Redlands, Duarte, Barstow, Indio, Riverside, Oasis, East Los Angeles, Needles, Alaska, Utah, Arizona at the Navajo and Hopi Nations and in Victorville. For the past three years there have been students on the program during January. We want the program to be flexible enough so that a student may have a community insight experience anytime he wants. Some times of the year are better than January as far as the communities are concerned—there's more going on at other times of the year.

GENE DOLD (Johnston College):

At Johnston the need is felt to provide the opportunity for students to have an in-depth understanding of the many cultures in our society. Most college preparation seems to be aimed at the dominant culture patterns in this country. Community Insight recognizes the many parts of our society and tries to acquaint the student with them. But it is more than a textbook acquaintance. It is an experience which is deeply felt and strongly influential to the student. It is an education beyond the classroom. More than anything else, Community Insight has the task of developing cultural awareness and the ability to communicate across cultures to a student. It is particularly aimed at students who may enter professions such as teaching, law, government and social services.

BATY:

True, it would be my view that Community Insight would be good for any person training for leadership or other contributive roles in the society. Many of our great problems today stem from the fact that there are deep cleavages in the society. People of different colors tend to avoid one another. There are rifts even between people of the same color. To the extent that the failure to communicate is a human problem, then all students could benefit from learning how to improve their communications in the important human relations areas. I agree with what you say, Gene; I just think the potential involvement could be from everyone, not just those who plan to go into certain professional fields.

Our recruitment process illustrates what I mean. The recruitment process is an educational experience in itself and is open to any interested student. We try to have a series of experiences over a time which will help the student decide whether and when to become further involved. For example, in the "weekend drop," students spend a week-end visiting one of several of the participating communities in order to develop realistic expectations of what the month-long experience would be like if they chose to participate. These visits are accompanied by "talk-out" or "rap" sessions during which the students share their experiences with each other and the staff members responsible for the program.

As students become clear about their plans they prepare an academic "contract" or "work-plan" in conjunction with their sponsoring professor or professors. Through the work plan the student specifies his needs, objectives, resources, procedures and the way in which he wants to be evaluated. For some students the contract reflects course work preparation. Last fall three courses were offered which were deliberately designed as alternative approaches to preparing for Community Insight. One was Community Studies, which dealt with the structure of communities, community processes and the dynamics of community involvement. Another was Educational Anthropology, which dealt with the problems the culturally different student faces in many of our schools where the emphasis tends to be mono-cultural. The third course was Cross-Cultural Social Psychology, and sought to help the student develop a cognitive picture of what happens to a person when he undergoes a cross-cultural experience. Some of the students who went on Community Insight this past interim participated in these seminars.

BARBARA WEBER (Johnston College):

I'd like to interject here the importance of the preparation courses. I was enrolled in Cross-Cultural Social Psychology and through that course realized I wasn't ready for Community Insight. That just wasn't where my head was at. I came to Johnston really counting on spending the interim with the Hopi. Through the class I realized there were lots of things I had to do *before* I was ready to get far into another culture. And there was no stigma attached to me for deciding not to go. That was one of the really good things about the preparation—you were always free to decide not to go. The preparation helped each of us make the decision for ourselves whether we were ready.

COMMENT:

You mean there is no screening or selection? Can anybody get into the program if they decide they want to?

DOLD:

There is no formal requirement for a student to participate. The informal requirement is that the student is interested and committed to understanding a multi-culture society and his place in it.

BATY:

Yes. What we try to do is provide a good—a "real life"—sample of what the student can expect and leave the decision up to him or her. Of course, if it is clear to the staff or community coordinator that the student has some serious personal problems or hang-ups getting in the way, then we counsel the student to take care of the hang-ups first. We have had some students decide to postpone the experience, as Barbara mentioned, and we have had a few go in spite of our advice to the contrary. It is worth mentioning that in almost every instance our reasons for advising the student not to go were substantiated by the student's experience. What this means is that there is some clinical data available that is helpful in assessing student readiness to participate which has some predictive validity. However, to keep us humble, there have been instances where we thought students were not ready but they had a positive experience; and there are also instances where a student seemed to be ready but dropped out soon after arriving in the field setting.

COMMENT:

Aren't there tests you could use to help make the judgment about readiness?

BATY:

There are no tests I know of which are helpful in predicting student effectiveness in the Community Insight experience. We are still in the stage of gathering data to describe what happens and maybe from that will come some testing procedures. I would personally prefer that we not place too much emphasis on such tests. The real test, after all, is the test of experience and the short-term "drop" concept should be a step in the right direction. In my view, the person best qualified to make the choice of readiness is the student, provided he or she has a pretty good idea of what to expect from the experience and from himself.

COMMENT:

How much preparation is enough? I mean, what has worked so far?

BATY:

The short-term experience before the month-long home-stay has turned out to be crucial. In addition there are the talk-out and orientation sessions—but I may be talking too much. Let's get some more response from those who have been on Commuity Insight. Jim (Walker), you went out to the Navajo country for your "drop;" maybe you could add some light to this.

JIM WALKER (Johnston College):

I went out to a Hopi mesa over Thanksgiving (1971) for about three or four days. I know I had a lot of fantasies and ideas and everything before I went out there . . . I didn't even know who I was going to be staying with . . . . Even in that short time it was more just passing through, more of a tourist type experience. Still, I learned a little more about it and met a few people . . . . It cleared up a lot of my misconceptions. If I'd just gone straight into that situation and moved in with a family I would have had all these original fantasies and ideas about just what the Hopi Indians are like physically—you know—as far as buildings and villages and that sort of thing; and then there's all the other type of stuff about the people that I'd have to learn anyway. It really helps just to have gone a little ways.

BEAL:

In Victorville there is what we call a "weekend drop." This is where the student goes to the community where he is to live and stays with the family for one weekend. It is difficult, yet rewarding, for a student to come into a community and live with a family with a different cultural and economic background. For the most part, the student is on his own, with no contacts, except the community coordinator. This weekend drop is a warm-up for a longer home-stay. It gives the students the opportunity to get an idea of what to expect for the longer stay. It helps the family too.

BATY:

I'd like to comment from sort of a theoretical point of view. Whenever you go into another culture for the first time—even coming to college as a first year student—there is a period of adjustment. That period can be long or short depending on how far you have to adjust and how quickly you learn to respond to the new clues that are in the environment. Adjustment is often a perplexing and troublesome experience. Whatever can be done to facilitate one's adjustment will help bring on the time when the individual is acting effectively in his new environment and meeting the new sets of expectations that are being placed on him.

For example, look at what colleges try to do with admissions—what we are doing at Johnston. We are trying to figure out ways we can help students who are interested in the college have a good idea of what to expect when they get here. We've used some techniques like having students just drop in and visit classes. Naturally they leave with a very incomplete picture of the learning experience at Johnston, where much more goes on than meets the eye. What we need in admissions is more of what we are trying to do with Community Insight, like providing opportunities for the students to discuss their observations with people who are knowledgeable about the setting so that images can be built which reflect reality. If the students in either case can anticipate accurately what they are going to find when they arrive in a situation there will be less surprise of a negative kind and less of what anthropologists call "culture shock." It could be, as has happened, that after a weekend experience you decide it's not your cup of tea. If there are no pressures or obligations imposed to continue farther than you feel up to, then, it seems to me you can only benefit. The community is bound to benefit more too if students don't arrive for a month and then leave after a short time because what they find is not what they had been hoping to find.

COMMENT:

I was thinking more in terms of . . . like, you might have to read ten books before you go or something like that.

BATY:

Well, another theoretical assumption behind Community Insight is that book learning is not powerful enough to prepare a person much for this kind of experience. What books sometimes do is set up a number of stereotypes and biases which then create a lot of dissatisfaction if you don't find what you've been led to expect. One student was quite bothered during his homestays because the blacks he met were not at all like those he had expected to find after reading *Malcolm X*. Or if you read Kluckhohn on the Navajo, and you get out to Navajo Mountain, it is going to be very difficult to make the connections between what you have read and what you find. I like to argue that there is a great deal to be said for approaching this whole experience as a child and learning from all the other things, not from reading at all, but as a child learns how to survive by imitating and modeling himself after the adults in the environment and other children. You can learn a lot by opening up your other senses that get shut off when you're in school.

JOPLIN:

It would probably be advisable to do some reading, though. I think that when you look at a good reading list you can find certain books that give you an accurate account. That can be helpful in terms of helping, you know, a little bit so that you can learn more, and not be held back by trying to understand what everyone around is taking for granted. Like you want to say, well read DuBois, or works by Jones maybe or—there are so many written by the regular types of people that are an accurate account of living—that will give you an accurate account of being or living the experience of a black. Reading can help you to build —you know—a little bit before you go, so that you can understand without groping, or lose time trying to think about what is actually happening.

BATY:

This sometimes is true. What I was trying to say is that there are a number of alternative ways of getting into this. I would hope that a person would have read ten books by the time he's finished, but to say that you have to read ten books before you begin sounds a little wooden. Maybe it sounds wooden to say that you have to read ten by the end!

JOPLIN:

It might be if you have had some involvement with an agency before—that will give you a good background too. Lots of experiences can transfer to Community Insight. You ought to be better prepared than just "dropping in."

COMMENT:

How about the family I might be with? Would they have any knowledge of why I'm there? Might they be offended by what I would say or do?

BATY:

It is possible to find yourself with a family that will have no knowledge at all of what is happening. The coordinator might say to them "I want you to put this person up," and they'll say "O.K." and then you arrive and have to explain the whole thing. Now that is an extreme case to be sure. But it is possible to find that kind of situation. Other situations on the "drop" might be with families that have been briefed or families who have already had Community Insighters and they might just want to help out in this particular way.

JOPLIN:

Everybody is pretty well hand-picked—the people you'd be staying with. That's my experience. Like, especially Neitha (Mrs. Beal), she would never place anyone with, well, with great problems in the home, from what I know. She takes great pains picking her families.

COMMENT:

Is this weekend required before the interim?

JOPLIN:

It is strongly recommended . . . but it doesn't mean that you'd have your "drop" in the same community where you'd spend the month.

COMMENT:

Can someone who's not planning to have a cross-cultural experience for a long period of time, can they have a weekend drop?

BATY:

Sure. It's open to anybody at Johnston who wants to give it a try.

COMMENT:

Is it usually . . . well, one night and two days?

BATY:

Two nights and three days. You go Friday and come back Sunday.

COMMENT:

And you just do what they do or . . .

BATY:

You take it as it comes, brother. We have found that by not promising anything the outcome is much better than if we say, "If you go on a weekend drop you can expect such and such to happen and derive so and so results; and you can expect 'x' from us." We don't promise any help at all. And you come out of it much better than if we promised you all sorts of things that we might never be able to come up with every time.

COMMENT:

What really happens during the month the student is living with the family? What do they do? How do they spend their days and nights?

BEAL:

In Victorville, they get *involved!* I tell them they are to become a member of the family and not be a guest. They have to get right in and involve themselves with the family life and the community life. Some students stay in the home for most of the time, caring for younger "brothers" and "sisters." Others spend most of the day working as interns with community organizations. You see, many people participate in Community Insight. There are the families the students live with, the agencies they work with, the Community Coordinators, the Johnston College staff and students from Johnston.

JOPLIN:

Most of the students who have been on the program have middle-class backgrounds. Another important facet of the program is the placement of black and Chicano students in the homes of middle-class white families. It is our feeling that it is just as important for minority students to have an intensive cross-cultural experience as other students.

COMMENT:

You have mentioned the community coordinator now many times. Just what is a community coordinator? Who is this person?

DOLD:

The Community Coordinators are the backbone of the Community Insight program. They serve as a link between the college and the community. They are the ones who set up the home-stays and families and provide the contact for the agency the student is to work with. They also provide counseling for the students and a word of encouragement for a student when he experiences "culture shock." It really isn't much of a shock and students usually pass through it, as in many ways it helps the student to mature, but a reassuring word from the coordinator is certainly appreciated. Mrs. Neitha Beal has been the Community Coordinator for Victorville since the inception of the program three years ago.

BATY:

I'd like to go back and say something more about what students actually do during the home-stay and what happens to the student. What they are *not* supposed to do is make a sociological or anthropological study of the family and community in which they are living. There has been far too much "studying" of other people who themselves derive no benefit at all from such studies. Instead the ideal thrust of the program is for the student to examine his own feelings and reactions to the experiences in order better to understand his own culture, his own biases, his own racism that can get in the way of open people-to-people communication.

The dynamic which we think is at work is that the student begins to realize the inadequacy of many stereotypes he holds and sees his previous conceptions as being much simpler than reality. Through experience the images he uses to think about, and communicate with, people of other cultures become more complex and richer. Through the practice of having to communicate across cultures the student's self-confidence grows. Eventually more open and realistic communication and interaction can take place.

COMMENT:

Excuse me, this sounds great, but difficult to measure and evaluate. Do you just take subjective reports?

BATY:

We are researching the program itself and hope to learn more about how the experience actually effects change in the students. To date we have been looking at two clusters of attitudes related to racism, one we are calling "tolerance" and the other cluster we call "optimism." The tolerance variable relates to prejudice, authoritarianism and ethnocentrism. The optimism variable relates to the extent of student alienation from the society.

One effect of Community Insight seems to be an increase in the student's tolerance for life styles which differ from his own, thus reducing the student's ethnocentric biases and prejudice. The experience also seems to make students more realistic and mature with respect to their attitudes toward social problems and social dynamics. Students become more aware of the problems, for example, in the educational system and the need for changing education and health delivery systems for poor people. They begin to grasp ways in which institutions could become more responsive to minority and/or poor people. I think that to the extent the student has a more realistic appraisal of the structure and dynamics of community reality, his ability to work effectively in such environments improves. Fundamentally, it is a kind of knowledge which should really be taught to every citizen of the country. To understand and be able to criticize what you read in the newspaper or what you see on TV about minorities you need to have a base of experience from which to form opinions and judgments.

This isn't a complete answer and I see there are some other questions. But before I stop, let me finish briefly what I want to say about our research efforts, since this is of key importance. We have used a pre- and post-test design where each student is his own control. The instruments collect information regarding opinions and medical health. In addition, the students submit detailed journals of their experiences and the insights they derive from those experiences. They also take part in lengthy talk-out sessions before, during, and after their stay. Thus far we have gathered a great deal of useful data which we are using to assess the impact of the exposure to other cultures on the students.

COMMENT:

What about the families? How do they react to the students living with them?

BATY:

To date it has been difficult to gather information from the host families. Of course, just the fact that families want to have Insighters return another year is evidence that they are not "turned off" by the program. The information we have so far comes from reports of the community coordinators, augmented where feasible by personal conversations and discussions which I have held with the several families, particularly in Victorville. We know that the families are not motivated to participate just by the offer of $20.00 a week. Many of the families—particularly those who have been through the experience once—also see the idealism in the program and become excited about the possibilities.

I don't want to give the impression that we have tested all our hypotheses and that the thing is fool-proof. We have a lot of work yet to do, but we have done quite a bit. Those of you who are interested could read this report we prepared on the first year we developed the program—1969-1970. The report is entitled "Education of College Students for Cultural Awareness," and, as I said, is available from Johnston College.

COMMENT:

What happens when the student returns?

BATY:

We try to hold group and individual de-briefing sessions to help the student make sense out of his experience and make plans for follow-up.

COMMENT:

I mean, how does the student fit in when he gets back to college?

BATY:

Oh, that is an interesting question. What we have found so far is that in some cases there is "reverse culture shock." Getting thrown back into the milieu of Johnston after acculturating—in many cases to a life of poverty—for a month can be a real shock. Some students opt to continue in the field. One, for example, remained on the Navajo Reservation to work with a legal aid organization and he modified his contract to make that possible. Whatever feelings there are when the student gets back, however, are bound to be short-term since it is not long until the student is immersed in the familiar problems of college life. I would hope that there would be long-term changes, that a student would be permanently influenced, but we don't have any research to report on this yet.

COMMENT:

You mentioned something about "modifying a contract." Just what is a contract and how does it work?

BATY:

I've been responding to too many of the questions. Let's try to role-play an answer for you. Say we have a student working on his graduation contract and his advisor recommends a cross-cultural experience. He comes to me and Alan (Joplin) to talk about it. Mike (Calvert), this is a real event for you, why don't you "play" the student?

MIKE CALVERT (Johnston College):

O.K. The way my contract reads, I'm supposed to have a concentration in American middle class culture from an historical perspective, also taking into account how the minority cultures affect that or are affected by it. So at first, I was going to do my contract without including a cross-cultural experience; I was thinking, well, it's not really social work I want to do. I want to do history and I want to do it on an intellectual level, so Kevin (Dr. O'Neill) and I went into the graduation contract committee situation with that in mind. And then when we got into it—well, another thing was the time; we didn't think that I was going to have enough time to include any "extras," so we went into it with that kind of rationalization.

(Dr.) John Watt and several other good people on the Graduation Contract Review Committee said that if you're going to deal at all with the minority cultures, if it's at a cultural level or intellectual level or what, you should have first hand experience, whether it's with blacks or with Chicanos or wherever you think your special interests might lie. So I was thinking that because blacks are the biggest minority and probably the most influential, that I woud have some kind of cross-cultural experience with the black community. So that's how the dynamic went. I'm thinking of doing something if I can next interim.

BATY:

Well, do you want to have a weekend drop first in some community? Say during one of the weekends coming up?

CALVERT:

I'd rather do it next fall. I'm really swamped . . . .

BATY:

O.K. I think you're getting ready in a way with a tutorial you're doing with me in historical anthropology—more so than some. But I recommend that you plug into the weekend community drop.

CALVERT:

Well, I think the tutorial . . . the tutorial's really sold me on the value of it (Community Insight).

JOPLIN:

Do you think some kind of alternative Community Insight experience is needed? . . . or would it be the same thing for him? You know he's married and that month he wouldn't be home would be pretty bad. Is there some type of alternative, I don't even know what I'm thinking of . . . something that would still be in line with the program; not as the one month thing, or at least not all at one time, or something . . . .

BATY:

Well, the four weeks . . . no, it's pretty crucial as far as the minimum period of an in-depth look . . . well, it's something we could explore. . . . Let's stop the role-playing. I think we've demonstrated the kind of dynamic involved, even if we haven't completely solved your problem, Mike.

COMMENT:

I was going to ask you one more question, Roger. Last year when a leading authority in Native American Studies from Davis came out, Dan Gilbertson (Johnston College) asked him a question about the negative aspects of white students going out to find out where the Indians' heads are. And he was very negative about people doing that. I was wondering how those kinds of considerations get worked into the program?

BATY:

Sure. That is why I said the basic reason for participating in Community Insight should be to find out where your own head is at, and secondarily to become involved in some kind of work in the community where you are being of benefit. I'm glad you mentioned the issue of "finding out about them," because that's the way the whole project could be torpedoed. That's what we are trying to work against. Our whole plan of entré and interaction with the communities assumes that we are not sending in a group of amateur anthropologists whose main result will be a notebook full of notes about "how the Indians think." The purpose is to find out more about what you think by making a cultural adjustment. What are your own hidden assumptions? What are your own limits of tolerance? What ways do you communicate to other people that might be offensive to those who are not used or accustomed to your ways? The danger of students going out just to find out "where the Indians are" or "straighten the Indians out" or to disenchant them about "the evil white man"—and these are ideas we sometimes find students bringing to the program—this is always a risk. But we hope that the larger program emphasis helps re-orient them to other outcomes.

WALKER:

Right. In my stay with the Hopi I tried to make clear I wasn't another anthropologist coming out to write something about the Hopi. They don't like to have books written about them; in a sense they're tired of being studied. They kept asking, "How are you coming on your study of the Indians?" Their reaction in a lot of cases was kind of negative when they first saw me. Then after they talked with me for a while and I kind of explained what I *was* doing, that I wasn't trying to study them—one family that I was staying with, I showed them my contract that I drew up and the guy read it and said, "That sounds a lot like Hopi," or something like that. It just fit in. And I didn't really have that problem. I got a lot of those reactions at first but, at least in my case, after I talked to most people and they saw what I was doing, I didn't get those negative feelings.

BATY:

Well, it's getting late and on that note perhaps we could wind things up. I hope you can see that what we're moving toward is a model whereby the student would have a home-stay and might also be working with some agency in the community. That would help with entré and it also helps the student explain why he's there and what he's doing. It also gives the student a much closer insight into operation of organizations that function in the community and how they relate or fail to relate to the people with whom the students are staying. The most important thing about Community Insight, though, is that it adheres to the Socratic ideal of teaching you more about yourself. After the month you will know more about your own culture because you will have tried to relate person-to-person to people of another culture.

SESSION 10:

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Conveners: **John Chase**
Allen Killpatrick
James Wilson

JAMES WILSON (Northeastern University):

Cooperative education is not really an experimental form of education; Northeastern University has had it since 1909 and has over 9,000 students involved. It is a process where, after one complete year of study, a student alternates between full-time study and full-time work, for four years, thus completing a BA program in five years.

There are many values to cooperative education programs. Northeastern is an urban institution largely serving the youth of blue-collar families. Many of these students are the first in their families to go on to college. This program particularly helps them with vocational guidance. Northeastern is a professional university and these job opportunities let them develop knowledge and skills in their choice of fields. It is of benefit in a similar way to the students in the liberal arts program. Of course, the fact that the students earn money that can help pay the tuition rates of a private university is critical.

JOHN CHASE (Cleveland State University):

There is strong disagreement in cooperative education about the exact definition of the term. The Cooperative Education Division of the American Society for Engineering Education has had an association of institutions using coop-ed programs for eleven years, and there are many people who believe that if you do not use their model, you are not in coop-ed. If we use James Wilson's definition involving work (for money), you will eliminate half the schools using coop-ed because they do not do it in exactly the same way as Cleveland State University.

In starting programs, cooperative education can be defined as you choose. Some schools have work for money programs, others have volunteer service, travel, independent study, foreign study, and other alternatives. Some schools have cooperative education programs, but because of faculty prejudice against Northeastern's program, they do not call it that, even though they are doing the same things as Northeastern for the same social and economic reasons.

WILSON:

Some of my colleagues feel that for a program to be coop, it has to be on an alternating basis, the work has to be discipline related, and has to be progressively more difficult. The work does not have to involve pay—working in a kibbutz or some similar volunteer activity is a perfectly legitimate implementation of the coop idea. It is important to remember that the original schools developed this program within their own contexts and new schools should be able to do the same. The time periods do not have to be alternating quarters or semesters—they can be specified field periods or set up in some other format.

CHASE:

Students are not just sent off to find jobs. Most schools have developed a job bank of previous employers, which is constantly being added to. There is also assistance and supervision from faculty advisors. They help the students plan the experience, give support during it and help evaluate it at the conclusion. These things are characteristic of almost all coop institutions.

Many liberal arts institutions are recognizing the coop model as a good one, but they don't want to follow exactly the old engineering model, particularly the working for money bit. Students are coming to college to learn how to cope with society, and society is basically composed of people doing things to resolve problems. Being involved in a social service organization or living on an Indian reservation can help the students better understand the intercultural problems that exist. How can we help them do that? Our tuition isn't much, but sometimes they have a hard time getting that together. No matter how you would like to deal with the human problem in downtown Cleveland, you've got to bring home the bread. We use the federal College Work-Study Program to fund the students in those situations so that they can afford to spend their time doing that. The hourly rate goes from $2 to $3 and the work-study grants pay up to 80 per cent of that with the employer coming up with the rest. Most schools can do this. With this program you can move into areas you couldn't have otherwise.

Work study money must go to non-profit organizations. There are additional regulations as to who is eligible for the program. When the program first began it was very tight—maximum family income was $1800-$2000 a year. Since then the level has gone up to about $7600.

The intent of the program is to provide the aid to the lowest end of the economic strata who wish it. You can go indefinitely up the scale, but you can't arbitrarily give money out to families with $40,000 a year income and leave the families with $3,000 unsupported.

JOHN WISH (University of Oregon):

At The University of Oregon we have a relatively heavy emphasis on minority programs—for blacks, Indians, and Spanish Americans. Our work-study funds have been tight from day one. Then by federal regulation our work-study students are limited to 15 hours per week. We don't have the money for some programs—is this quite different from your institution?

CHASE:

The regulations say quite specifically that when classes are in session, 15 hours per week is the maximum permitted. When classes are not in session at Thanksgiving, Easter, or whenever, they can work up to forty hours per week. On any vacation period students may work up to 40 hours, and there can be full semesters or quarters off-campus on coop work.

We find a great advantage in using Federal Government money for lower division students. They want to go to work, they want to make a career for themselves somehow, and they have nothing to sell. You have to be able to perform some kind of task whether it's running a machine or writing a book or helping economists make a budget—whatever it is you have to be able to do something, to get paid. We try to use the work-study money off-campus to provide the social/cultural setting in which the student will learn something so that after the first quarter he has skill he can take to a profit-making organization. This helps relieve the pressure on your work-study funds—you never have enough. I wouldn't want to pretend I've got money coming out of my ears—we ran out of funds two months ago.

WISH:

There is a negative side to using work-study money in a coop program. It could be a terrible trap, if you put all your eggs in that basket. You cannot depend on getting the money—if you do you may find a lot of jobs just suddenly disappear if it doesn't come through. This is not especially serious if you "horsetrade," as our coordinators tend to do. They say, "OK, I'll give you a work-study job providing you give me a full-paying job at the same time." There is also the problem that students working on work-study are not sure that they get the best job that way. This is partly based on the fact that the employer is paying 20 per cent and that may be all he's interested in getting out of the student, whereas if he were paying 100 per cent, he might be a little more interested. I would never say don't use work-study because there are many instances when it's a godsend to have; but I would caution people against taking this as *the* answer.

ALLEN KILLPATRICK (Johnston College):

Two questions. What has happened about travel to and from jobs? What's the definition of work?

WILSON:

Some institutions, including my own, will make loans to students to get them to and from work, which the student pays back out of earnings. In other instances the employer would pay them for travel.

When we negotiate with the employer, we try to get as much money out of them as possible. They must pay at least 20 per cent. There is nothing that says they can't pay 90 per cent, but it is amazing what non-profit organizations know about these things. When you say you can fund a kid they want the whole 80 per cent because they know they can get that. But we find very often that the problem is that they don't have enough for a half-time person and yet they have a full time job to do.

As for the work definition, the money is to be used by students who must have the money to go to college, but cannot be a gift or grant. You can't just say "here's the money." A college can use work-study to get lots of menial jobs done at no cost to them—receptionists, messenger boys, floor sweepers. Unfortunately every job on campus uses 100 cents whereas off campus, it uses 80 cents. What we try to do is have our coordinator responsible for the development of activities and supervise them so that students are involved with meaningful activities within the definition of career exploration. They won't be receptionists unless they get involved with intake interview and things of that sort.

Coming back to the beginning: when you negotiate with the employer and he's willing to have wages set at $3 per hour, we say "why don't you set it at $2.50 and give the rest straight to the kid for transportation, lunch money, etc?" You don't have to consider what he can come up with as the necessary base, nor do you have to fit into a salary scale so you have to use all his money in paying hourly wages. You can negotiate his money in any way you can for the students' advantage.

COMMENT:

What are your administrative costs, your overhead in your program?

CHASE:

The university's budget to operate our department is about $200,000. That includes on an off campus work-study and the placement office, and a few other things, so it isn't entirely fair to put that down as being for the coop-ed program. That takes care of about 1000 students.

WISH:

Ours is cheaper—it's a million dollars for 9,000 students.

KILLPATRICK:

One of the things that needs to be cleared up is whether a work-study student can go to work for an agency that has not had interns of any kind before.

CHASE:

Sure.

DON BLATCHLEY (Johnston College):

Since so many of your programs are related to engineering and scientific areas, how has it been affected by the current economic situation?

WILSON:

It has worked out reasonably well, in terms of actually getting students on jobs. We would normally have 2 per cent unemployment anyway for whatever reason—illness, family sickness, other things. We just had a changeover period—the day of changeover we were 93 per cent employed and we were up to 97 per cent by the end of the week. The thing is that the jobs are not all that good. Because of the economic situation, there has been a lowering of the kinds of jobs available, and that in turn means that our large staff of coordinators is not living quite the good life it did for a long time.

We have grown big rapidly in the last 10 years. Most of the coordinators, like students, have never experienced want. Up to two years ago we had more jobs than students and we were kind of cavalier about the way we treated employers. We wouldn't go and see them and we'd tell them what to do. "You want the student or we drop you." The students got to be quite cavalier as well. They would say "I had a great job with IBM in Poughkeepsie, but I've never been to California—get me a job in California." And the coordinator would pick up the phone and get a job in California. Well, it doesn't work quite that easy any more. They're doing plain hard work now, out pounding the pavement looking for jobs for students.

BLATCHLEY:

What is the percentage of employment in the Boston area?

WISH:

Roughly 70 per cent are within 4 miles of the university and the other 30 per cent are all over the country and the rest of the world.

CHASE:

You have to guard very carefully against the trap that John (Wish) just mentioned. We had 250 jobs with six companies three years ago. When the economy let down there weren't any jobs left. If you are going to have a coop program dealing with profit-making places, you have to have people who have some experience in that world. You can't argue with a firm caught in an economic squeeze unless you have some experience.

WISH:

They only have two motives for taking students—one is they have jobs that need to be done and these kids can do the jobs and, two, they're looking for full-time employees and this gives them a chance for observation of potential employees.

KEITH JOHNSON:

How many other schools in the area do the same thing? How do you coordinate efforts so that your employer isn't talking to five schools in five days?

WILSON:

We don't. He is. We even have trouble just within our institution to keep our own coordinators off a single employer. We are supposed to have a "prime contact" system, but it tends to break down. The only other schools in the area that have coop programs are Roger Williams College (Rhode Island), Graham Junior College (Boston), and Brian McIntosh Junior College. The University of Massachusetts (Amherst) has a little program, too. In any event, there aren't many.

CHASE:

You can either muck up the situation with the employers or you can cooperate with the other institutions. Some people believe very strongly that there should be something so formal as a "National Job Bank" on a computer. You put in whatever extra jobs you have and pluck out whoever you need. Somehow we've got to come to that kind of thing. Informally, many of us have.

WILSON:

For example, Antioch might call and ask if we could find jobs for five of their students who want to spend their coop period in Boston. Right now we might say no—we're really hurting ourselves. But we've placed people for them before, and they'd be willing to do the same for us. We're developing a relationship with a college in England right now that has a similar program where we hope to exchange students.

CHASE:

This matter of competition becomes very important, you know. Case Western, Cuyahoga Community College, Baldwin-Wallace, Dike College—none of these schools has a coop program under that name, but they all have off-campus programs. . . . So now we have five colleges in Cleveland knocking on the doors of our employers and not only that, but now when my science coordinator goes to the hospitals, he finds my liberal arts coordinator there because of the student interest in social service and psychology. So the hospital says "What are you doing man?" And then we find out that Akron was there, Cincinnati is coming tomorrow, and Antioch has been there every day for a year. It gets to be a real hassle.

JOHNSON:

I would think it would be a case of diminishing returns—suddenly people would start locking their doors.

CHASE:

Somehow that doesn't happen.

COMMENT:

I would expect that because of the job market and the economy they might start knocking down the prices and playing you off against each other. Some students will come to work for $1.25, too.

CHASE AND WISH:

That hasn't happened yet either.

WISH:

There is frequent in-person contact, if not by phone, so these things don't seem to happen. Personal relationships are established. If particular problems evolve and if the student doesn't work, then the employer calls the coordinator and they'll get to work on it right away. But one of the things I think is important about coop ed is that though care is taken to place the student, once he is there we no longer can manipulate what's going to happen—he's facing life as it is. For example, when General Motors had its last strike and we had some students working for them—the students wanted to know what to do. We said they could come home or stay. If they came home we would try to find another job. If they stayed they could either cross the picket line or join it. That was their choice alone.

COMMENT:

Where does the professor fit into it all. What about the evaluation process?

CHASE:

We have a committee structure at Cleveland State. Each college has an elected coop committee of faculty and students and the chairman of each is on the University Committee. In the programs of urban studies, education, social service, where there is specific credit given toward a degree, there are evaluation interviews with the staff in those departments. The University Coop Committee believes we should interview *each* student coming back. It's very important to do that—but you should have released time.

We require reports from everyone and most of them are written. We don't require them to be written and the instructions are ambiguous as to what we do expect in terms of student evaluations. But the faculty have rejected reports that do not fit the traditional job description.

The coordinator in almost every program is concerned about finding experiences that students in his institution might be interested in. It takes a long time for a student to come down to something (a particular job) he could deal with. The process now at most colleges is one of referral. The coordinator and the student go over a number of jobs and they come to an agreement. Mostly it is the student's responsibility to pick. The coordinator is responsible for reminders about limits, requirements, and general advice from experience. The student then goes to the employer he chooses and gets his interview. We provide some basic support to students who have not done that (interviewing) before. We're optimizing his chances for success, but still he has to make it himself. With new employers and students, you have to use your judgment—you can't see them all even if you think it would be worthwhile to do so.

COMMENT:

The issue of credit does arise, doesn't it?

CHASE:

We require six coop periods, which satisfies "coop" requirements. If, say, a student walks off three jobs and we get ticked off, then we could go to the academic standing committee and file a complaint to withdraw the student. As for academic credit, we (staff and student) negotiate with department chairmen. Four or more coop periods satisfactorily completed qualify a student for a certificate.

I realize our time is up and there must be many more questions. If so, I hope you will feel free to write to me.

SESSION 11:

ALTERNATIVES FOR FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION

Conveners: Robert Leaver
John Wish

JOHN WISH (University of Oregon):

Let me make just a few preliminary remarks. Primarily my teaching is that of working with students on research projects outside the classroom.* One of the major projects on which my students and I have been working involves alternatives in the marketing and funding of higher education. In September 1971 the University of Oregon, Student Projects Incorporated, published our first interim report "Issues of Grants and Loans to individuals: Oregon As a Case Study." First let me make clear that I do not expect any "new money" for higher education. I believe we have to allocate better the presently available funds.

Furthermore, I think there should be anti-trust and truth-in-advertising laws to ensure open competition and honesty among colleges. Further, I advocate full cost tuition at all colleges and grants and loans from the government to individuals. I think such changes would encourage experimental colleges. A part of our study will be coming out in an abbreviated form in *College and University Business* in May, 1972. That article purports to show that almost 90 per cent of the decline in percentage of students attending private colleges is due to tuition differences between the private colleges and public colleges. This evidence tells me that if the dual system continues, private colleges are done for. Private colleges *will die!*

---

* For a complete description, see my article "Students in the Community 'Doing It' Through Beachhead College," *Journal of Business Administration,* Vol. 3, #1, Fall, 1971.

In Oregon, which is where we studied it, I'd say that all private colleges would be out of business within 10 years. And there would be at least 3 or 4 out of business within 4 years—3 or 4 out of 12. And the chance of new schools starting—the chance of new colleges surviving, the chance of innovative schools surviving—in the atmosphere we have today, is virtually nil. It is just a matter of time until the new college runs out of the initial missionary enthusiasm.

The idea of some institutions being subsidized, and some institutions not being subsidized, is ridiculous. It can't be justified in the late 20th Century. We're applying the tools of "industrial organization" to the "higher education industry." Some of my administrative friends say "but higher education is not an industry." And I say, "I know it's not but let's look at the model from industrial organization and see what we have." As I see it the dual system of "private" and "public" universities will go. Either all institutions will be subsidized or none will be.

COMMENT:

Of course all education except proprietary education is subsidized in one way or another. Private education is subsidized in most cases. There are varying calculations as to what the subsidy is, but every student gets something by reason of endowments and things of that sort.

WISH:

But the gifts to private schools are falling off.

COMMENT:

Oh, yes. That's one of the pitfalls of private education. Apart from the competition of public low tuition.

WISH:

Let me shift the discussion and refocus things a bit—we have been discussing some philosophical issues at the macro level.

These issues of funding have applicability to the micro level. Let's hear some of the interesting things happening.

COMMENT (Roger Williams College):

Maybe we have an alternative. Maybe it's a modification of what exists, and I'm not sure it would work on a large scale. We only had 55 students but—see what you think of it. At the Roger Williams College—University Without Walls unit—we've set up tuition at $1600 for 12 months and the student gets a check made out jointly to his facilitator ("faculty advisor" to you more traditional types) in the amount of $1000 for a period of 12 months. Half of that $1000 is designated for the facilitator's time and the other half for the student's learning experience. Now, the student has control of his $500 dollars. He can shop around; he can order the courses he wants; work with adjunct faculty or any other people he wants; buy the books he needs. He has control of the kinds of things he wants to learn with that $500 dollars. It seems to be working pretty effectively. Remember that of the $600 remaining, half goes to Roger Williams College and half goes to the University Without Walls contingent of which I am a part. The student designs where he wants to plug in his money. The whole thing about this is that we're trying to lower the cost, because if you're not on the campus or something what's there to pay for?

COMMENT:

You're speaking specifically about an undergraduate program?

WISH:

Yes, it's been in operation since September 1971.

COMMENT:

The $500 dollars per student that goes to the facilitator, is that part of his salary?

WISH:

That's his entire salary. That's all he gets. Another thing we've done is that we've utilized all part time people. We have no full time faculty people. We use people on the parent institution faculty, members of the community, community leaders, a couple of ministers: those are the kinds of people that are acting as facilitators for us. We also use adjunct people—we call them skill models. In a sense we're borrowing the resources of what's already available.

COMMENT:

You mean a facilitator may be anyone that the student chooses, and that facilitator gets $500 dollars for each student?

COMMENT (Roger Williams):

Yes. There is mutual selection. . .

COMMENT:

Is there a contract written between them?

COMMENT (R. W.):

We have a learning contract, but is is not like the learning contract that Johnston College has. It's just an informal registration kind of thing. The contract includes the names of student(s) and facilitator and the day they begin. It is signed by them and the registrar and the bursar—it's just a financial kind of thing. . . . The college gives no minimum salary guarantee. We have no credits. We do have a bachelor's degree from the Union of Experimenting Colleges. The procedure is one that is individually oriented to each student. We have several students who are older—30 per cent of our student body is over 25. Several are in their 50's. The students who come to us want to learn specific things—they know what they want and they develop a program with their facilitator. The degree is granted when the student and facilitator request the degree.

COMMENT:

The facilitator is the only one who evaluates that?

COMMENT (R. W.):

No, there are all kinds of evaluations. There is peer evaluation which we think is important; self-evaluation; adjunct faculty evaluation; if you're working on an internship, the person you spend a lot of time with would also evaluate you; these various evaluations all become part of your continuous record.

COMMENT:

Do you have requirements?

COMMENT (R. W.):

We don't have any requirements, but we encourage a variety of experiences. That's one of the requirements, so to speak, in our degree process: variety of experiences.

COMMENT:

[illegible]s been in operation long enough to see how acceptable this degree is in other higher institutions of higher learning?

COMMENT (R. W.):

No, we just started in September 1971.

COMMENT (Lone Mountain College):

Lone Mountain College, San Francisco, has been involved in an operation like that for three years. On our master's program we give up to 50 per cent rebate on tuition and let the student go into the city to people there for what he needs, subject only to his facilitator's approval. So, the degree is roughly half the price formerly and we full-time faculty are more in the role of counselors putting together the best possible program. We've tripled our enrollment and put our resources to better use. The students can use our faculty for what they're good at instead of stretching them into everything. So, we're quite pleased with it.

COMMENT:

How much does—or would—it cost?

COMMENT (Lone Mountain College):

Our tuition is $1800 per year, and up to 50 per cent of that is rebated to the student for buying the instruction he needs. Now in our BA program, beginning this semester, we're permitting each student to take ¼ of his tuition back and invest it with any learning experience that his advisor approves including the possibility of taking up to one year off for credit with no additional payment to us except an overhead fee of $10 a unit. And I don't know how that's going to go, but I do know we've got 30 tenured faculty members and we're facing a collision course with tenure. Unfortunately, we're making money. I mean with this system of flexibility, our enrollment has gone up almost 50 per cent. There are more and more students coming and learning, and enjoying and paying for what we can do well at the college.

COMMENT:

Is your program just Bachelor's and Master's or. . .

COMMENT (Lone Mountain College):

It's BA, BFA, BM, BS, MA and about 5 Masters.

COMMENT:

Are you thinking of going all the way, or. . .

COMMENT (Lone Mountain College):

Well, through the San Francisco Consortium we're going to offer a doctorate. In that consortium is San Francisco State, City College, University of San Francisco, Hastings Law School, Golden Gate College.

COMMENT:

The Union of Experimenting Colleges offers a Ph.D. program. Unfortunately it's not as flexible, in the financial way—they do have a drawing account in it also. But what they're thinking of doing now is to go on the concept of what you're doing. Except there would be a flat fee for the degree, with the details to be worked out—depending how long it takes the person to do it. I don't know how long it'll be before it's implemented. The contract is to be jointly agreed upon.

QUESTION:

How about the program at Lone Mountain College; is it accredited?

COMMENT (Lone Mountain College):

Yeah, sure. We've been kicking around since 1898. We used to be known as San Francisco College for Women. We're finding that what we need more and more is a switchboard type of college. I've recommended that we sell our library and use the libraries of the city and other universities a block away.

COMMENT:

Your proposal of selling the library is a dramatic one and an interesting one from the point of view of what we can do to reduce the load of overhead. Would you sell the library and depend totally on the public library?

COMMENT (Lone Mountain College):

I propose that we give our books to the University of San Francisco library which is exactly one block—300 yards away—they'd love our gift. We'll get to use our library for other things. We need all kinds of places to meet.

COMMENT:

Instead, could you use the public library as suggested by perhaps strengthening it in certain areas? Can't you use all kinds of community institutions? If the answer to either of these questions is yes, is this a rip-off, as somebody (Harold Hodgkinson) said yesterday?

COMMENT (Lone Mountain College):

I think not, because most of these community resources are under-utilized. What we've found in going to the community is that community people and institutions are the most responsive people we've got.

COMMENT:

May I ask about Lone Mountain Accreditation? You say you've been accredited for a hundred years; but aren't you concerned about the new programs you've added and their relation to accreditation?

COMMENT (Lone Mountain College):

No. Not at all. But, I'll let you know better March 2nd when an accreditation team is coming. I'm really not worried. We've done a self-study and I think the whole thing has institutional integrity, which is what Western Association asks. Our program has the complete commitment of students, faculty, administration, and trustees. We're not just playing around with a playful program. We're doing what we believe in. Also, we are moving away from the liberal arts things and towards professional outputs. We're interested in students' growth and learning and that adds up to something for the students. The students respond to that with a lot more commitment to learn. We don't know where it's leading; that is, it almost seems to be leading to a new kind of vocational college. But the students seem to be interested in becoming professionals at something. But it doesn't bother us because the liberal arts content which the faculty represent seems to be better communicated than when we were trying to be a liberal arts college. So we're just saying, well, it isn't quite the way we were trained but it seems to make sense from the very dynamic point of view.

Now, we're having to hire a lot more psychologists, because counselling is a much heavier trip. Our core faculty are turning out to be systems analysts—social facilitators—just a different kind of faculty; and that's producing a direct conflict with the content faculty that we have.

COMMENT:

The main difference is that the faculty member in the situation that you describe, would sit with the student as the student sets up his own goals and objectives, rather than institutional goals and objectives being set up and evaluated against what you major in.

COMMENT:

I would agree that in many fields, this sort of approach would be very useful, particularly if the person's already tried a number of things and there is something real he wants and can get by the time he gets out. But what about the laboratory sciences where, at least traditionally, everybody spends a lot of time in the lab? I think it's important within the present structure of our society and our preprofessional programs to do it that way. How is this handled in these schools, or do these schools essentially attract people who are not interested in the sciences?

COMMENT:

We have some people who are somewhat interested in science and what they've been doing is arranging for other places to work and go to school—you know—a lab, or where a study center might be. For instance, a group took off for Mexico and traveled in the Gulf there and read biology. So there is that type of thing. You don't need a center to do that—you can still move around to different places, and have a good experience. . . .

COMMENT (Lone Mountain College):

You don't really need equipment. We have contracted with the University of San Francisco one block away. They built too many science labs and they're paying a full time faculty, and they need students. So, if our students need counseling in the direction of pre-professional science training, we put them into those courses. But we don't have to build things. And we've found businesses and laboratories in the Bay area that would also give training to our students. We're not dodging the issue. But we don't feel we have to be the ones who have to build it and have the overhead.

COMMENT:

I'm glad to hear that. Because it certainly is true that many schools have too much in the way of labs. This is our problem; our science division is over-built.

COMMENT (Lone Mountain College):

One thing we need is a lab that's full of electronic equipment and master craftsman. Our art department has turned into studios and performing artists because that's what the students want and that's what we're hiring. We need to install computer-technical equipment because that's what students need to learn and I've even suggested that we ask IBM or one of these giant corporations to run it. They really know how to run these things and provide instruction.

COMMENT:

It would be interesting for some of you who are from private colleges to investigate with your lawyers the possibility of reneging on your long term debts of your buildings, some of the buildings that the government encouraged you to build a few years back and which are millstones around your neck now. Declare bankruptcy of one unit and have another unit with a similar name like that that's still there and so on. . . . This is done in business all the time.

COMMENT:

We have this dormitory that is a millstone around our necks and under the government laws it cannot be used for anything else but a dorm.

COMMENT:

Now that can be challenged and changed. We did it. We gave the government the choice of us not paying it off or letting us run a hotel there. It depends on how many dollars you have outstanding. The Feds don't want to repossess the dormitory. What are they going to do with a dormitory? In fact the government said, "We don't want it back; what can you do with it?" They even offered to put money into it to remodel it!

COMMENT:

I'm into another aspect of financing. Not because I'm in the hopes of solving it, but because we haven't dealt with it. The question has to do with the larger capacity of the economy to support higher education at the level we think it needs to be supported.

WISH:

I think it is being supported enough already. Even though my livelihood comes from education, I would not support an increase in public support to advanced schooling. You're going to find a growing number of people, even among educators, who will not advocate more money for the same old programs. There needs to be some means of forcing the schooling industry to come to terms with itself.

COMMENT:

I'm not opposed to that but I do think that it can be argued that there are still apt to be areas of educational needs in the United States that are under-supported financially. All one has to do is read through the papers—the last annual supplement of the *New York Times* is filled with concern about lack of money. Colleges and all these institutions are having trouble or are in deep trouble. Frank Newman yesterday mentioned that the federal government spends 30 billion dollars on education already and that sounds like a large amount of money—but it seems to me if you look at what is going on educationally in the schools, I think good arguments could be constructed for putting more money into universities and enabling them to expand services, enabling them to offer a higher quality of education.

WISH:

Do you know of any studies that show that more money provides better output or more money results in better citizens?

COMMENT:

I know studies that show differences in achievements by educational institutions. . . . . But on the average, no. . . . why is there a surplus of teachers right now? I think it's because there's not enough money to hire them. It's not because they're not needed. All I wanted to do was relate this problem to the problems of the general economy and ask whether enough money was available for higher education.

COMMENT:

I'm from the design department at Southern Illinois University and I am one of those involved in the World Game design. We're having a workshop this summer at which we will be delighted to charge a small fee for educating a whole slew of people who would like to come.

WISH:

And this returns us to the problem of financing the use of community resources rather than building our future overhead on campus. There's one thing that hasn't been mentioned, but I think it's an obvious possibility—this deferred tuition scheme which both Yale and Duke have adopted and which Gov. Gilligan of Ohio proposed at state level. Considering the financial problems of the states, it can become a very interesting eventual alternative when they look at it from the point of view of financing state universities this way, and perhaps at the same time producing capitalization for the private schools.

WISH:

The study my students and I are working on ("Issues of Grants and Loans to Individuals: Oregon As a Case Study") touches on those issues. In Oregon there is discussion of a deferred tuition plan in conjunction with some form of portable scholarships. Probably if deferred tuition and long term loans are used, it will be at the graduate level—especially medical schools, law schools, and business schools. We're in contact with various persons throughout the state—and I think these things might come faster in Oregon because Oregon is one of the very few states where all tax measures are referred to the people for vote. Even the basic school tax has to be voted on almost every year in every district. So all tax measures are voted on by the people. I think our financial crunch of being unable to pay for schooling for everybody who wants it, is going to come faster in Oregon.*

I see a voucher system coming, (or call it edu-credit, or portable scholarships or birth rights) coming for all Oregon citizens who have not fed at the public trough for post-high school schooling. A grant available for 3 or 4 year education—tied in somehow with wealth or income. And then for graduate school, I see some sort of a state corporation that will provide for long term loans for those who want to go on for more schooling. I think some measures toward that will be adopted in the next legislative session, and some other measures will be adopted in the '75 legislative session. As I see it my students will have a hand in the research that leads to these legislative decisions.

COMMENT:

That's what I was going to ask you. How long before you see something like that happening? As I can see it, I don't see it happening for a long time in state colleges.

---

* See my paper "Education Is More Than School."

WISH:

It will happen in Oregon soon—we are a high service state, with low wealth. We've not had the defense department largesse —which California has had; there can be no deficit financing in the state. In addition a Serrano-type court case is being filed shortly. Assuming the courts rule the same way as in California, we're in trouble. There's a constitutional provision that the state must provide public education for grades 10-12. This will mean less money for public higher education; I think the crunch is coming much more rapidly in Oregon than elsewhere. But it will hit the rest of the country.

COMMENT:

Is there any movement federally because of seeming inequities—all kinds of inequities—coming up within anything state-oriented?

WISH:

Yes, there are two higher education bills before Congress right now—the House version and the Senate version.

COMMENT:

Which of those two do you favor?

WISH:

Well, I favor the Pell Bill, even though Edith Green is a Congresswoman from Oregon who is the main sponsor of the House version.

COMMENT:

We think the Green Bill would help us, as a small college. . .

WISH:

Oh, I'm certain—if you're institutional administrators you certainly would prefer the greater institutional support that comes from the Green Bill; if I were a university or college president, I would prefer the Green Bill. As I am not, I prefer the Senate bill which has more aid for individuals.*

WISH:

Are there any other comments on financing higher education?

COMMENT:

I wasn't listening too closely, John, to your initial presentation but, it sounds to me as if your ideas would elicit a great deal of opposition in most locations. Had you articulated the ideas, say, in New York during this past month, you would have occasioned a good deal of outrage. I don't know if you would care to respond to the controversy between Governor Rockefeller and Mayor Lindsay when Rockefeller proposes, say, subsidies to private institutions in the state of New York virtually at the expense of raising tuition significantly for students going to City College. Perhaps that's a declaration of war. New York City staged it and now that's a terrible controversy—an enormous financial problem that the state and city have, and I don't know how you would avoid the political brouhaha.

WISH:

There is a passionate argument going on throughout the nation on these issues. Passionate arguments are settled in various ways. It seems to me that the Hansen and Weisbrod studies on benefits and costs of education, which were done in California, should be replicated in other parts of the country—other parts of the nation. The controversy raged about their book in *General Human Resources,* if you want to get into it. Basically, their finding was the California's system—the California State College system of low tuition, and institutional support from state government—*has resulted in a redistribution of income from the poor and middle class to the rich.* Why? Because the children of the rich go on to college in greater proportions; the children of the rich stay in colleges longer; the children of the rich go to the most expensive of the state colleges. So from the perspective of using tax revenue as a re-distributive mechanism, their contention is that in California, tuition has resulted in a re-distribution the wrong way. Now, is this true at CCNY? I don't know.

---

* Editor's note: The 1972 Higher Education Act was signed by the President as this publication was going to press. See Session 12, p. 252.

COMMENT:

Hansen and Weisbrod really don't answer his question though. If you take California and you say, all right, we're going to replace the current scheme in California with a voucher system because it will be more equitable, then your question comes to that kind of a fight in New York—because all of the people who now have the advantage of the subsidy in California are going to show why God intended it to be that way. Especially since—if they're right—subsidy does go to the sort of people who have political leverage. But his question is, what can we do about it?

WISH:

There is a book by E. G. West, *Education and the State.* It's essentially historical—a look at how public education was introduced in Great Britain. It's a revisionist view in which West contends that things are not what they seem. We've got to talk about the kinds of things that West is talking about; we've got to talk about the kinds of things that Illich is talking about: what are the outcomes of financing schools as if they are free goods? Schooling is not a free good. If we could get everybody in education and every student to understand the voucher system. . . but I'm still somewhat skeptical about the short-run prospects of getting it, because the people who are going to have to give up their subsidies and pay more in taxes aren't going to want to.

COMMENT:

That's the reason I'm even less optimistic than you—about getting the voucher system, although I'm completely in favor of it.

WISH:

And then we have some very effective and very powerful managers of the existing institutions who want to preserve the system as it is. I'm just saying for my own part, I'm working to change it in some small way.

Editor's Note:

John Wish and his student research team received a grant from the Esso Education Foundation in July, 1972, to do research ascertaining the feasibility of an experiment with Portable Scholarships in Oregon Higher Education.

SESSION 12:

THE HIGHER EDUCATION BILL: SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR EXPERIMENTING INSTITUTIONS*

C. W. Leeds III

At the Johnston Symposium in January proposed legislation for reform in higher education was discussed. In particular, bills being proposed by Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island and Representative Edith Green of Oregon were compared. After months of congressional committee work a single bill emerged, passed, was signed by the President, and now is the law of the land. Public Law 92-318 passed by the 92nd Congress on June 23, 1972 is a modified version of Senator Pell's bill.

At the Johnston Symposium in January, 1972, I spoke in support of the Pell bill (S.659) as having more positive implications for innovative institutions of higher learning than any other proposed legislation. I shall not reiterate my January arguments, comparing a bill which did not pass with an earlier version of the one that did pass. Rather, let me go right to the new Higher Education Act and point out some passages which may have special significance for experimenting institutions of higher learning.

This Act, Public Law 92-318, amends the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the General Education Provisions Act (creating a National Foundation for Postsecondary Education and a National Institute of Education), the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public

---

* Editor's note: Because of its remarkable timeliness, this up-to-the-minute abbreviation of the just-passed Senate bill, edited by Clarence Leeds, has been used instead of the session on "Role of the Federal Government in Financing Higher Education: The Pell Bill," convened by Clarence Leeds and Richard Hays.

Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, and related Acts. Unless otherwise specified, each provision of this Act is now effective and first year appropriations are for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973. The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS; EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Revision of Title III (Strengthening Developing Institutions)

Sec. 121. (a) Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

AUTHORIZATION

Special assistance

Sec. 301. (a) The Commissioner shall carry out a program of special assistance to strengthen the academic quality of developing institutions which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of the Nation but which are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life.

Appropriation

(b) (1) For the purpose of carrying out this title, there are authorized to be appropriated $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1975.

(2) Of the sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year, 76 per centum shall be available only for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to developing institutions which plan to award one or more bachelor's degrees during such year.

(3) The remainder of the sums so appropriated shall be available only for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to developing institutions which do not plan to award such a degree during such year.

ELIGIBILITY FOR SPECIAL ASSISTANCE

Developing institution

Sec. 302. (a) (1) For the purpose of this title, the "developing institution" means an institution of higher education in any State which—

(A) is legally authorized to provide, and provides within the State, an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or is a junior or community college;

(B) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association determined by the Commissioner to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered or is, according to such an agency or association, making reasonable progress toward accreditation;

(C) except as is provided in paragraph (2), has met the requirement of clauses (A) and (B) during the five academic years preceding the academic year for which it seeks assistance under this title; and

(D) meets such other requirements as the Commissioner shall prescribe by regulation, which requirements shall include at least a determination that the institution—

(i) is making a reasonable effort to improve the quality of its teaching and administrative staffs and of its student services; and

(ii) is, for financial or other reasons, struggling for survival and isolated from the main currents of academic life.

Waiver

(2) The Commissioner is authorized to waive the requirements set forth in clause (C) of paragraph (1) in the case of applications for grants under this title by institutions located on or near an Indian reservation or a substantial population of Indians if the Commissioner determines such an action will increase higher education for Indians, except that such grants may not involve an expenditure of funds in excess of 1.4 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to this title for any fiscal year.

Application

(b) Any institution desiring special assistance under the provisions of this title shall submit an application for eligibility to the Commssioner at such time, in such form, and containing such information, as may be necessary to enable the Commissioner to evaluate the need of the applicant for such assistance and to determine its eligibility to be a developing institution for the purpose of this title. The Commissioner shall approve any application for eligibility under this subsection which indicated that the applicant is a developing institution meeting the requirements set forth in subsection (a).

Junior or community college

(c) For the purposes of clause (A) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section, the term "junior or community college" means an institution of higher education—

(1) which does not provide an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree (or an equivalent degree);

(2) which admits as regular students only persons having certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education (or the recognized equivalent of such certificate); and

(3) which does—

(A) provide an educational program of not less than two years which is acceptable for full credit towards such a degree, or

(B) offer a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or physical or biological sciences, which program is designed to prepare a student to work as a technician and at the semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields, which fields require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles of knowledge.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

Establishment

Sec. 303. (a) There is hereby established an Advisory Council on Developing Institutions (in this title referred to as the "Council") consisting of nine members appointed by the Commissioner wth the approval of the Secretary. (b) The Council shall, with respect to the program authorized by this title, carry out the duties and functions specified by part C of the General Education Provisions Act and, in particular, it shall assist the Commissioner—

Post, p. 326

(1) in identifying developing institutions through which the purposes of this title may be achieved; and

(2) in establishing the priorities and criteria to be used in making grants under section 304 (a).

USES OF FUNDS

Grants and awards

Sec. 304. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants and awards, in accordance with the provisons of this title, for the purpose of strengthening developing institutions. Such grants and awards shall be used solely for the purposes set forth in subsection (b).

Ante, p. 241

(b) Funds appropriated pursuant to section 301 (b) shall be available for—

(1) grants to institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of planning, developing and carrying out cooperative arrangements between developing institutions and other institutions of higher education, and between developing institutions and other organizations, agencies, and business entities, which show promise as effective measures for strengthening the academic program and the administrative capacity of developing institutions, includng such projects and activities as—

(A) exchange of faculty or students, including arrangements for bringing visiting scholars to developing institutions,

(B) faculty and administration improvement programs, utilizing training, education (including fellowships leading to advanced degrees), internships, research participation, and other means,

(C) introduction of new curricula materials,

(D) development and operation of cooperative education programs involving alternate periods of academic study and business or public service or employment, and

(E) joint use of facilities such as libraries or laboratories, including necessary books, materials, and equipment;

National Teaching Fellowships

(2) National Teaching Fellowships to be awarded by the Commissioner to highly qualified graduate students and junior faculty members of institutions of higher education for teaching at developing institutions; and

Professors Emeritus Grants

(3) Professors Emeritus Grants to be awarded by the Commissioner to professors retired from active service at institutions of higher education to encourage them to teach or to conduct research at developing institutions.

Application approval conditions

(c) (1) An application for assistance for the purposes described in subsection (b) (1) shall be approved only if it—

(A) sets forth a program for carrying out one or more of the activities described in subsection (b) (1), and sets forth such policies and procedures for the administration of the program as will insure the proper and efficient operation of the program and the accomplishment of the purposes of this title;

(B) sets forth such policies and procedures as will insure that Federal funds made available under this section for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for the purposes of the activities described in subsection (b) (1), and in no case supplant such funds;

(C) sets forth policies and procedures for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the project or activity in accomplishing its purpose;

(D) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to insure proper disbursement of and accounting for funds made available under this title to the applicant; and

(E) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and affording such access thereto, as he may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

The Commissioner shall, after consultation with the Council, establish by regulation criteria as to eligible expenditures for which funds from grants for cooperative arrangements under clause (1) of subsection (b) may be used, which criteria shall be so designed as to prevent the use of such funds for purposes not necessary to the achievement of the purposes for which the grant is made.

(2) (A) Applications for awards described in clauses (2) and (3) of subsection (b) may be approved only upon finding by the Commissioner that the program of teaching or research set forth therein is reasonable in the light of the qualifications of the applicant and of the educational needs of the institution at which the applicant intends to teach.

(B) No application for a National Teaching Fellowship or a Professors Emeritus Grant shall be approved for an award of such a fellowship or grant for a period exceeding two academic years, except that the award of Professors Emeritus Grant may be for such period, in addition to such two-year period of award, as the Commissioner, upon the advice of the Council, may determine in accordance with policies of the Commissioner set forth in regulations.

Stipend and dependent allowance

(C) Each person awarded a National Teaching Fellowship or a Professors Emeritus Grant shall receive a stipend for each academic year of teaching (or in the case of a recipient of a Professors Emeritus Grant, research) as determined by the Commissioner upon the advice of the Council, plus an additional allowance for each dependent of such person.

Limitation

In the case of National Teaching Fellowships, such allowance may not exceed $7,500 plus $400 for each dependent.

ASSISTANCE TO DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

Waivers, eligibility

Sec. 305. (a) Each institution which the Commissioner determines meets the criteria set forth in section 302 (a) shall be eligible for waivers in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) (1) Subject to, and in accordance with, regulations promulgated for the purpose of this section, in the case of any application by a developing institution for assistance under any program specified in paragraph (2), the Commissioner is authorized, if such application is otherwise approvable, to waive any requirement for a non-Federal share of the cost of the program or project, or, to the extent not inconsistent with other law, to give, or require to be given, priority consideration of the application in relation to applications from other institutions which are not developing institutions.

Ante, p. 238. Post, p. 247

(2) The provisions of this section shall apply to any program authorized by title II, IV, VI, or VIII of this Act.

Non-Federal share requirement

(c) The Commissioner shall not waive, under subsection (b), the non-Federal share requirement for any program from applications which, if approved, would require the expenditure of more than 10 per centum of the appropriations from that program for any fiscal year.

Limitation

Sec. 306. (a) None of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 301 (b) (1) shall be used for a school or department of divinity or for any religious worship or sectarian activity.

Effective date

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective after, and only with respect to, appropriations made for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1972.

Part E—Direct Loans to Students in Institutions of Higher Education

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

Sec. 461. (a) The Commissioner shall carry out a program of stimulating and assisting in the establishment and maintenance of funds at the institutions of higher education or the making of low-interest loans to students in need thereof to pursue their courses of study in such institutions.

(b) (1) For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to make contributions to student loan funds established under this part, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $375,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and $400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1975.

(2) In addition there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received loans for academic years ending prior to July 1, 1975, to continue or complete courses of study.

(c) Any sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (b) for any fiscal year shall be available for apportionment pursuant to section 462 and for payments of Federal capital contributions therefrom to institutions of higher education which have agreements with the Commissioner under section 463. Such Federal capital contributions and all contributions from such institutions shall be used for the establishment, expansion, and maintenance of student loan funds.

Part C—Loans For Construction of Academic Facilities

AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 741. (a) (1) The Commissioner shall carry out a program of making and insuring loans, in accordance with the provisions of this part.

(2) The Commissioner is authorized to make loans to institutions of higher education and to higher education building agencies for the construction of academic facilities and to insure loans.

(b) For the purpose of making payments into the fund established under section 744, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year shall be available without fiscal year limitations.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

Sec. 405. (a) (1) The Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide to every person an equal opportunity to receive an education of high quality regardless of his race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or social class. Although the American educational system has pursued this objective, it has not yet attained that objective. Inequalities of opportunity to receive high quality education remain pronounced. To achieve quality will require far more dependable knowledge about the process of learning and education than now exists or can be expected from present research and experimentation in this field. While the direction of the education system remains primarily the responsibility of State and local governments, the Federal Government has a clear responsibility to provide leadership in the conduct and support of scientific inquiry into the educational process.

(2) The Congress further declares it to be the policy of the United States to—

(i) help to solve or to alleviate the problems of, and promote the reform and renewal of, American education;

(ii) advance the practice of education, as an art, science, and profession;

(iii) strengthen the scientific and technological foundations of education; and

(iv) build an effective educational research and development system.

Establishment

(b) (1) In order to carry out the policy set forth in subsection (a), there is established the National Institute of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Institute") which shall consist of a National Council on Educational Research (referred to in this section as the "Council") and a Director of the Institute (hereinafter referred to as the "Director"). The Institute shall have only such authority as may be vested therein by this section.

(2) The Institute shall, in accordance with the provisions of this section, seek to improve education, including career education, in the United States through—

(A) helping to solve or to alleviate the problems of, and achieve the objectives of, American education;

(B) advancing the practice of education, as an art, science, and profession;

(C) strengthening of the scientific and technological foundations of education; and

(D) building an effective educational research and development system.

(c) (1) The Council shall consist of fifteen members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the Director, and such other ex officio members who are officers of the United States as the President may designate. Eight members of the Council (excluding ex officio members) shall constitute a quorum. The Chairman of the Council shall be designated from among its appointed members by the President. Ex officio members shall not have a vote on the Council.

(2) The term of office of the members of the Council (other than ex officio members) shall be three years, except that (A) the members first taking office shall serve as designated by the President, five for terms of three years, five for terms of two years, and five for terms of one year, and (B) any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the remainder of the term for which his predecessor was appointed. Any appointed member who has been a member of the Council for six consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment to the Council during the two-year period following the expiration of such sixth year.

(3) The Council shall—

(A) establish general policies for and review the conduct of the Institute;

(B) advise the Assistant Secretary and the Director of the Institute on the development of programs to be carried out by the Institute;

(C) present to the Assistant Secretary and the Director such recommendations as it may deem appropriate for the strengthening of educational research, the findings of educational research and of insuring the implementation of educational renewal and reform based upon the findings of educational research;

(D) conduct such studies as may be necessary to fulfill its functions under this section;

(E) prepare an annual report to the Assistant Secretary on the current status and needs of educational research in the United States;

Report to President and Congress

(F) submit an annual report to the President on the activities of the Institute, and on education and educational research in general, (i) which shall include such recommendations and comments as the Council may deem appropriate, and (ii) shall be submitted to the Congress not later than March 31 of each year; and

(G) meet at the call of the Chairman, except that it shall meet (i) at least four times during each fiscal year, or (ii) whenever one-third of the members request in writing that a meeting be held.

The Director shall make available to the Council such information and assistance as may be necessary to enable the Council to carry out its functions.

Director

(d) (1) The Director of the Institute shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

80 Stat. 463; 83 Stat. 864.

The Director shall be compensated at the rate provided for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, and shall perform such duties and exercise such powers and authorities as the Council, subject to the general supervision of the Assistant Secretary, may prescribe. The Director shall be responsible to the Assistant Secretary and shall report to the Secretary through the Assistant Secretary and not to or through any other officer of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Director shall not delegate any of his functions to any other officer who is not directly responsible to him.

(2) There shall be a Deputy Director of the Institute (referred to in this section as the "Deputy Director") who shall be appointed by the President and shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

5 USC 5332 note

The Deputy Director shall be compensated at the rate provided for grade 18 of the United States Code, and shall act for the Director during the absence or disability of the Director and exercise such powers and authorities as the Director may prescribe. The position created by this paragraph shall be in addition to the number of positions placed in grade 18 of the General Schedule under section 5108 of title 5, United States Code.

80 Stat. 453; 84 Stat. 1955 research

(e) (1) In order to carry out the objectives of the Institute, the Director is authorized, through the Institute, to conduct educational research; collect and disseminate the findings of educational research; train individuals in educational research; assist and foster such research, collection, dissemination, or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with, public or private organizations, institutions, agencies, or individuals; promote the coordination of such research and research support within the Federal Government; and may construct or provide (by grant or otherwise) for such facilities as he determines may be required to accomplish such purposes. As used in this subsection, the term "educational research" includes research (basic and applied), planning, surveys, evaluations, investigations, experiments, developments, and demonstrations in the field of education (including career education).

(2) Not less than 90 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (h) for any fiscal year shall be expended to carry out this section through grants or contracts with qualified public or private agencies and individuals.

5 USC 101 *et seq.*

(3) The Director may appoint, for terms not to exceed three years, without regard to the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code governing appointment in the competitive service and may compensate without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, such technical or professional employees of the Institute as he deems necessary to accomplish its functions and also appoint and compensate without regard to such provisions not to exceed one-fifth of the number of full-time, regular technical or professional employees of the Institute.

Rules and regulations

(f) (1) The Director, in order to carry out the provisions of this section, is authorized—

(A) to make, promulgate, issue, rescind and amend rules and regulations governing the manner of operation of the Institute;

(B) to accept unconditional gifts or donations of services, money or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible;

(C) without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U.S.C. 529), United States Code, to enter and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements or other transactions as may be necessary for the conduct of the Institute's work and on such terms as he may deem appropriate with any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or with any State, territory or possession, or with any political subdivision thereof, or with any international organization or agency, or with any firm, association, corporation or education institution, or with any person, without regard to statutory provisions prohibiting payment of compensation to aliens;

(D) to acquire (by purchase, lease, condemnation or otherwise), construct, improve, repair, operate and maintain laboratories, research and testing facilities, computing devices, communications networks and machinery, and other real and personal property or interest therein as deemed necessary;

(E) to acquire (by purchase, lease, condemnation or otherwise) and to lease to others or to sell such property in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, patents, copyrights, computing programs, theatrical and broadcast performance rights or any form of property whatsoever or any rights thereunder; and

(F) to use the services, computation capacity, communications networks, equipment, personnel, and facilities of Federal and other agencies with their consent, with or without reimbursement. Each department and agency of the Federal Government shall cooperate fully with the Director in making its services, equipment, personnel and facilities available to the Institute.

49 Stat. 1011

(2) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 2762-2762-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; U.S.C. 133-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276 (c)).

64 Stat. 1276. 5 U.S.C. app. 63 Stat. 108

(g) Where funds are advanced for a single project by more than one Federal agency for the purposes of this section, the National Institute of Education may act for all in administering the funds advanced.

Appropriation

(h) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, with fiscal year limitations, $550,000,000, in the aggregate, for the period beginning July 1, 1972, and ending June 30, 1975, to carry out the functions of the Institute. Sums so appropriated shall, notwithstanding any other provisions of law unless enacted in express limitations of this subsection, remain available for the purposes of this subsection until expended.

Effective date

(b) (1) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective after June 30, 1972.

Repeals

(2) (A) Effective July 1, 1972, sections 516 and 517 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 1, 2) are repealed.

Ante, p. 326

(B) Effective July 1, 1972, section 422 of the General Education Provisions Act is amended by striking out "[as set forth in section 516 of the Revised Statutes (20 U.S.C. 1]" and inserting in lieu thereof "(as set forth in section 403 (a) of this Act)."

These are but a few passages of the new Higher Education Act. Perhaps at next January's Johnston Symposium we could engage in a floor discussion of implications of the new Higher Education Bill for experimenting institutions. What we learn together next January could benefit innovative institutions as early as April, 1973.

APPENDIX I*

ADMISSIONS IN AN EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE

Convener: Allison Jones (Johnston College)

The session in Admissions discussed the following topics: (1) the admission process for experimental schools; (2) the importance of grades and board scores as predictive criteria of student success; (3) attrition rate of experimental schools and its effect on admissions; (4) definition of terms used to describe experimental institutions.

Admissions Process

The participants agreed that the process employed by the Admissions Office was effective in assessing a prospective student's motivation and in predicting success in an experimental institution. This process places the greatest importance upon personal interviews, which may last from thirty minutes to three hours. This process is particularly important in interviewing students whose applications are received after deadline. A supplement of questions is also essential in student assessment, and all prospective students are asked to respond to the following questions: (1) Discuss your present understanding of (in this case) Johnston College and why you have chosen to apply. (2) What images, moods, or (3) What experiences have been the most educational? (4) Who or what have been the major influences in your life? (5) What do you like most about yourself, and in what areas do you feel the greatest need for growth?

In addition to answering these five questions, the student is asked to select and respond to five out of eight questions:

1. What is education and its value to you?
2. What does "learning how to learn" mean to you?
3. Give us a description of the community in which you live. Discuss your involvement with this community.

---

* Some of the sessions to be included were not salvageable in their entirety, and are offered here in summary form.

4. How do you react to criticism?
5. What do you fear most?
6. Describe the happiest moment of your life.
7. How do you see your first-year learning experience at Johnston College unfolding? (Keep in mind that students design their own course of instruction.)
8. What cultural contacts have you had in your community or country which have been different from your own? How do you wish to expand on this experience?

Each student is asked to submit three personal recommendations in an effort to supply the Admissions Office with further data on the potential of the candidates. A portfolio of the student's work is strongly encouraged. Finally, transcripts and college board scores are submitted to give a total view of the student. No student is denied or admitted on the basis of grades and boards alone.

In organizing and setting the policies of Johnston College a "Risk" category was established under which students can be admitted in spite of academic and/or emotional difficulties. Twenty per cent of each entering class can be "Risk" students. Although applicants are not denied solely on grades, it is safe to suggest that a student with a 1.50 GPA in high school will have difficulty in gaining admission.

If the Johnston College Admissions Committee (composed of students and faculty) determines from either personal interviews or recommendations that this student has potential that has not been tapped but who will probably succeed and flourish in an open learning environment, then the 1.50 GPA individual will be admitted as a "Risk." Since all applicants remain nameless in the Risk Admissions Committee, no students or faculty know which students have indeed been admitted as "Risks." The list of names is kept in the Admissions Office and a follow-up study on each student is conducted at the conclusion of each year. At this point, it is safe to say that these students have been most successful.

Use of Students and Faculty in Admissions

Students and faculty are essential components of admissions work. Not only do they serve on the Admissions Committee, but they also travel to high schools and junior colleges to talk to prospective students. When applicants visit the campus, they talk to the Admissions Office, to a faculty member, and to a student. Thus, each student receives input from the standard divisions of a college: administration, faculty, and students.

Attrition

Since the student interested in innovative institutions is usually an independent thinker, he may sample two or three schools before dedicatig himself to one.

Johnston College has often found that students who attended the first year transferred the second and returned the third, convinced that Johnston could, after all, meet their needs more directly and adequately.

The immediate problem of attrition to any Admissions Office is the "guessing game," i.e., how many students will return each fall. Since budgets are established according to enrollment, it is essential to have an accurate head-count. There is no unanimous answer for this problem.

Minority Recruitment

Minority recruitment was determined to be a common problem among experimental schools. The minority student is not yet willing to "experiment" with his education and searches instead, for a "traditional" institution.

UNIVERSITY WITHOUT WALLS

The UWW program is sponsored by the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities. The UWW concept is that of providing an alternative college level experience, not necessarily for the typical college age student. The attempt is to design and build alternative approaches to education for people anywhere from sixteen to seventy years of age. These can be people who (for example) have had a year or two of college and became involved in business, got married, started raising families, and now don't have the time to take off from their job, leave their homes, and go back to school. Yet a degree may be essential to them in terms of job mobility, meeting promotion standards, and so on. The UWW concept is designed to meet the need for continuing educational experience past the age when formal schooling will ordinarily have ended.

Programs are set up by the students and worked out under the contract system. They make use of staff members, faculty members, and adjunct faculty. In this context "adjunct faculty" refers to anyone recruited by the student to help him with the completion of his project. Every project is individualized and therefore different.

These projects have only just begun and there are many questions yet to be answered. What is the validity of this kind of program? What does an A, B, or C mean? What is the status of a UWW project in California, sponsored by a school in Missouri, and granting degrees under the union charter in Ohio? What is a degree? What do you give credit for? Where do students go for resource information?

Answers to most of these questions are now available in the UWW "First Report."*

---

* For a copy, or for further information, write:
Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities
Antioch College
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

INTERNATIONAL SERVICE OPPORTUNITIES

The discussion in this session centered around International Service, a special program (through OEO) of supervised long-term work. The best known example is the Peace Corps, which currently has some 5,000 volunteers working around the world. Their particular emphasis is on long-term work and on being in, and contributing to, the culture being visited. Until recently, part of the general requirement for Peace Corps work was a BA degree; but now the Peace Corps is starting a pre-degree internship and training program with selected universities.

SUNY is representative of the program for teachers. Courses related to their eventual work are part of the selected students' curriculum. Special training is done during the two summers before and after a student's senior year. After the end of the second training period, the students are sent to teach in Peru or Columbia for the Peace Corps. Two years later, at the culmination of the program, they receive a teacher's certificate.

The University of Minnesota is representative of a similar program for agriculture students. The Peace Corps needs agriculture students as a result of requests from other nations. The university recruits the agriculture majors, they jointly select the candidates for the program, and the expense is in part shared by the Peace Corps. Part of the college curriculum is oriented toward the Peace Corps service. The student's final semester is spent in Morocco studying French and Arabic society. Both of these programs carry full academic credit.

The Peace Corps and the International Service are different from many OEO programs in that they are group enterprises, are supervised, and are looking for long-term commitments from mature people. The conclusion agreed to was that the Peace Corps was not the place to "find yourself." If one hadn't already, then one would be in trouble, and unable to do much good for the people one was with.

The specific skills requested are many. The emphasis is on more technical skills and fewer humanities majors. The demand for teachers remains large, but not as large as it used to be.

The people being sought need not have specialized training, but they do need a mixture of common sense and higher education.

There are other government service programs besides the Peace Corps—AID, the Teacher Corps, and ACTION are three others. The Teacher Corps is a one year program leading to a MAT. Students work (a light work-load) in a ghetto, and take courses on the side to get the degree. There are also private international service opportunities—these are again service, not study opportunities. The American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service (200 Park Ave. South, New York, NY) publishes a book listing most of the available opportunities from the church, the Salvation Army, World Neighbors, and the YMCA, and includes a geographic breakdown. Most of these organizations, especially the churches, are very poor. They all have contacts and can assist in placement and guidance, and some send books and other things; but they cannot pay one to work. Job availability is not as certain as in the Peace Corps or UN agencies. The student will also have to cover his own transportation costs as well. Housing in some cases might be free and living costs lower. But they can at least provide placement, and that is critical for the student, school, organization, and country, if all are to benefit.

Undergraduates—with their stereotyped expectations—need much work to prepare them for these service opportunities. They will probably have to start with physical labor, and may with luck gradually progress to some community development work. But they should know that it takes much experience to develop a community and there are many things that can go wrong in a foreign culture. Language difficulties are particularly bad. In general, the discussants felt, private organizations are better for undergraduates than public ones.

If a school is interested in setting up an International Service program, the first thing it must do is assess the market. The best way to assure a ready demand so the program will not falter is to join several campuses together in sponsorship of the same program. There are also many possibilities (not developed here) that can come from exchange with foreign students to work in community development.

There is one school that does include foreign service as a part of its design: Friend's World College. It is a four year college, accredited, and has six centers around the world. It seeks an international student body. The program starts with the student at his home base where he spends time getting to know his own culture. After that comes study and service abroad at the other centers, then return home to study journals and to discuss experiences with his advisor.

Some schools having programs with Peace Corps:*

1. Cal Poly - San Luis Obispo
2. Colorado State
3. Cornell
4. Florida A & M
5. Lincoln College
6. Michigan State
7. Ohio State
8. Oregon State
9. Purdue
10. San Francisco State
11. SUNY Brockport
12. SUNY Buffalo
13. Tennessee State
14. Texas Southern
15. University of California - Santa Cruz
16. University of Hartford
17. University of Illinois
18. University of Massachusetts
19. University of Minnesota
20. University of Southern California
21. University of Wisconsin at Madison

---

* For further information write:
Ed Holmes
P. C. Internship
Action—Washington, D.C.

UNIVERSITY YEAR FOR ACTION

ACTION is a new governmental "super" agency made up of old departments such as the Peace Corps and VISTA. They have set up the University Year for Action to have a Federally sponsored program which enables universities to give an experimential type of education to students. There are four parties involved: One is ACTION, a federal agency serving as the grant giver. The second is the university, which serves as the manager of the program and ensures the credibility of the project. The third group consists of the students who serve as volunteers. The fourth group is made up of the many sponsors for whom the students actually work. They can be local, federal, or state governmental agencies; any non-profit group; or any community group.

The students work full time on their projects for a year. The government pays them a monthly stipend of $220 for their work. During the year they are expected to make normal progress towards their degree (30 credits). Exactly what they are to be evaluated on is up to the university. In addition to the work the student is doing, he also arranges for tutorials and independent studies in topics directly related to the project he is involved with. These are not intended to take him away from his work, but to give him credit for work closely related to his project. To be able to carry a full load academically as well as work, a student must interrelate his academic work so that it will help him solve problems at his job, so that by doing the class assignment, he will be improving at his job, and in doing his job he will be reinforcing his class learning. Academic work is not intended to be above and beyond the job. For example, a student need write only if it is necessary for the organization that he is working for. There is, in addition to this type of writing, a journal to be kept of the experience.

The university's relationship to the project is that of validator of the experience. It provides training, backup, and decides upon the methods of evaluation to be used. There is some instruction and supervision to assist in this evaluation process; but it is basically a managerial relationship. It should be noted in passing that evaluation of the success of the project does not in any way affect the student's grade for the experience. The emphasis is on learning experimentially and one can learn a lot by *lack* of success.

Bernie Fisken (Johnston College) noted that in most cases it was very difficult to set up a program such as this and have it succeed in the first year—that people were going to have to brace themselves against disappointment brought on by their own over-expectations.

There are many different projects that the UYA volunteers can work for. The recruitment for these projects is up to the sponsoring university. The projects do not receive any money from the government in this program—the only thing they receive is a free trained worker. Examples of projects include counseling in high schools, California State Consumer Service Division, Headstart, etc.*

---

* For further information write to:
Jerry Brady, Director
University Year for ACTION
806 Connecticut Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20525

EXTERNAL DEGREES

Most of this session was used for the informal presentation of information about external degrees by Educational Testing Service men John Valley and John Summerskill.

The initial problem was one of definition: what is externality? The most common external degree program discussed was the examination model used by such programs as those run by the University of London and the New York State Regent's Board. John Summerskill expressed the philosophy behind this program as being "where a student gets knowledge is immaterial as long as a student can work at a certain level in prescribed areas." But there are few set limits to this model. Some programs have entrance exams, others don't; while none have residence requirements, some have the possibility of the requirement of study at a teaching institution; some programs are only for BA's, others go up to PhD's; some are run by teaching institutions, others are not.

John Valley stated that external degrees permit external studying for the purpose of meeting internal evaluation and degree requirements. This opens the door to other considerations. Are Adult Education courses and Extension courses to be considered as external degree programs? They are taught by teaching institutions, but they are separate and external to the normal degree-granting process. Is a correspondence course an external degree program or not? The question is whether simply being physically removed from the source of instruction makes an external degree program. There are additional questions related to off-campus study with and without affiliated teachers and work experience; no resolution of them was achieved.

The failure rate in existing external degree or similar programs was a cause of great concern. It was noted that the University of London had a "very high" failure rate. The rate was not specified and it was not clear whether it was a rate for only "quitters" (people who resigned from a program), or "failures" (those who made it to exams and did not pass) or a combination of the two.

It was noted incidentally that it was a tremendous load on the University of London faculty to read all the essays and have so few good ones. John Summerskill noted that "even the best" of correspondence schools had a 90 per cent dropout rate, with most occurring in the first few weeks.

The group participants concluded that it took a very self-disciplined and highly motivated person to go through an external degree program. The failure rate suggests there aren't enough of these kinds of people around. Most people hoped that the programs would provide opportunities for adults out of school desiring further education. Valley noted that the first class of 40 at Empire State consisted of "migrating" college students all of whom already had 1-3 years of college experience (see the Newman Report).

The University of London program attracts an "international student body," many of them from former colonies, of unspecified age and social backgrounds. John Valley added that their (U. of London) program had been around for more than 100 years and had originally been oriented towards educating colonial civil servants.

The cost of an external degree was a topic of concern throughout the session. Many state legislators are looking at external degree programs as low-cost degree mills (Massachusetts, Minnesota, California). They are caught between the taxpayer and rising costs and they see this as a way out while possibly servicing even more people. Summerskill and Valley both repeatedly made the point that *no* cost analyses are available for *any* programs and that they do not want a cheaper education, but a better one. We can only hope that the legislators will see this point of view.

The University of London was the prime example of an external degree program used throughout the discussion. They give examinations (mostly essays) and grant degrees from the BA to the PhD. Some fields may require study at a teaching institution, but most do not. They do have entrance exams. Despite success (indicated as "several thousand" degrees granted in 1968), the program is being phased out. There are too many external students (15,000), and a new growth in campus programs. There are too many essays to read, and they don't want just to be "big business" in external degrees and hire readers. And so the program will soon be ended.

The New York Regents are using an examination model program to grant BA's. It will be open—no entrance exams and no instruction. The University of California, California State, and the University of Massachusetts are all looking at external degrees for all their campuses.

Among the comments, questions, and undiscussed topics which emerged were the following:

1) The field is moving very fast on two levels
    a) those looking at such a program and
    b) those just short of operation.
2) Would it be a "second-class" degree?
3) Is standardized testing valid?
4) Are correspondence schools different?
5) There are radio- and T.V. -based instructional external degree programs (England).
6) Adult Education programs are similar to External Degree programs and have a long history of operation, with many good students.
7) How do you assess off-campus and work experience?
8) How do you meet the challenge of not asking people to re-do what they've already done?
9) Will there be an equivalent integration of knowledge in a program of study over ten years as in one over four years?

The following common ideas and attitudes came out of the discussion on external degrees:

1) Social re-inforcement and pressures of the campus scene may be a good thing—there is much to be said for them.
2) Getting a degree does not always mean learning was achieved.
3) We should seek better ways of educating people, not cheaper ways.
4) Society will continue to require degrees (of some kind) from a large number of students if they are going to fit into the society.
5) Private schools, under financial pressures, will become more open to new credit-granting plans in order to attract students.
6) How does one assess off-campus and work experience?
7) Educational homogenization continues to spread. We need some variety, some programs not intended for everyone.

THE ROLE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN ACCREDITATION

The federal government does not accredit schools, but it would be inaccurate to say they have little connection with the process. Since so much federal money goes into higher education it feels it needs to have some set standards in order for schools to be eligible for those dollars. These accreditation agencies are, however, still voluntary organizations of colleges and universities who pass judgment on those who wish to join them. The federal government "accredits" these accrediting agencies by recognizing their accreditation in government programs. This recognition has occurred gradually over a period of time and now the federal government is very influential in setting the standards against which schools are judged. During this session, the key interest in this topic revolved around using pressure on the federal government to ease the accreditation pressures on new experimental colleges.

The accrediting body's role, it was observed, is to maintain high standards for degree-granting institutions. The pressure for a school to become accredited was said to come mainly from the federal government and from graduate schools.

Different regional bodies have different standards and different procedures, but the current (recent) policy in accreditation is goal evaluation for the individual institution, where the institution sets its own standards and is judged against them. Paul Dressel noted that the goals themselves are open to judgment. The question raised here concerns the personal development of students—how do you evaluate internal growth (the impact of the school) without having the process come down to evaluation of OPI results? One major complaint aired by participants in the session was that the accreditation team is "not willing to use our tools to evaluate us."

Much of the general conversation of the session was a discussion of the powers of an accreditation team. Hendricks from Mark Hopkins (see his paper, "Ban the B.A.") made clear the side effects of not being accredited: no foundation interest or money, and no Office of Education listing—which means no student loans, no surplus goods, no books, no federal money.

The explicit powers of an accreditation team are to make recommendations about possible improvements a college can make in its programs plus a recommendation for or against accreditation. Separate programs and graduate schools have separate accreditation. Accreditation is usually for a set period, but re-accreditation can be moved up if significant new programs are begun. Several participants saw this as a threat.

Representatives from Grand Valley University (Thomas Jefferson and William James Colleges) brought up the question of group and separate accreditation for cluster colleges. Paul Dressel made the case that the whole school stands or falls together, but others disagreed. They felt that there could be separate accreditation if there were "operational independence" —separate administration, faculty, and student body. The accrediting bodies have not yet set their policy in this area. It was pointed out that there were advantages to the group (blanket) accreditation policy—radical units of large universities could survive with programs which they couldn't get accredited separately.

The "philosophical discussion" of the session centered around the degrees that the accrediting bodies are supposed to protect. Hendrick (as in his paper) contended that students should seek learning, not degrees. Accreditation was condemned for its role in denying resources to non-degree granting schools. Vishwanath More (Johnston College) presented the position that there will always be levels as far as educational endeavor goes. They will be open to question, but they will be there. Other degrees were discussed, such as the Bachelor of Philosophy degree of Thomas Jefferson College (an inter/multi-disciplinary degree made up by the student). Paul Dressel feels that there will be more degrees instead of fewer in the future and that we should define the levels explicitly and award degrees to all who reach those levels, regardless of how.

APPENDIX II

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

JOSIAH R. BARTLETT: Wright Institute, 2728 Durant Avenue, Berkeley, CA 94704.

ROGER M. BATY: Faculty Fellow in Applied Anthropology and Education, Johnston College, University of Redlands, Redlands, CA 92373.

DONALD BROWN: Professor, University of Michigan, Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, Ann Arbor, MI 48104.

JOHN CHASE: Director of Cooperative Education, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH 44115.

PAUL DRESSEL: Asst. Provost and Director of Institutional Research, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48823.

GALE FULLER: Assoc. Dean, Director of Experimental Division, Westminster College, Fulton, MO 65251.

TOM GREENING: Psychological Services Associates, 1314 Westwood Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90024.

CONRAD HILBERRY: Berea College, Berea, KY 40403.

HAROLD HODGKINSON: Project Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, U. C. Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720.

ALLISON JONES: Admissions Counselor, Johnston College, University of Redlands, Redlands, CA 92373.

ALLEN KILLPATRICK: Faculty Fellow in Physics, Johnston College, University of Redlands, Redlands, CA 92373.

JAMES KOLKA: Executive Assistant to the Vice Chancellor, University of Wisconsin—Green Bay, WI 54305.

CLARENCE LEEDS, III: Simon's Rock College, Great Barrington, MA 01230.

CRICKET LEVERING: Community Consultant, Community Development Services, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901.

FRANK NEWMAN: Director of Community Relations, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA 94305.

ROBERT PACE: Professor of Higher Education, Dept. of Education, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90024.

E. NELSON SWINERTON: Executive Asst. to the Chancellor, University of Wisconsin—Green Bay, Green Bay, WI 54305.

WALTER E. TUBBS, JR.: Faculty Fellow in Neuropsychology and Philosophy, Johnston College, University of Redlands, Redlands, CA 92373.

ALBERT WIGHT: Interstate Educational Resources Service Center, 2269 Wyoming St., Salt Lake City, UT 84109.

JAMES WILSON: Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115.

JOHN WISH: Dept. of Marketing, Insurance and Transportation, College of Business Administration, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403

APPENDIX III

LIST OF EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGES AND EXPERIMENTAL FOLK, AND 1972 SYMPOSIUM PARTICIPANTS*

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
1.	Academy for Educ. Develop.	437 Madison Ave. New York, NY 10022	Pres.; Dr. Alvin Eurich
2.	Academy of World Studies	2820 Van Ness Ave. San Francisco, CA 94109	Pres.; Bennet Skewescox
3.	Antioch College	Yellow Springs, OH 45387	James P. Dixon, Pres.; Ewell J. Reagin, Assoc. Dean of Faculty
a.	Antioch-Columbia	Suite 200, Wilde Lake Village Green Columbia, MD 21043	Morris T. Keeton, VP, Prov.
b.	Antioch-West	149 Ninth St. San Francisco, CA 94122	Joseph H. McFarland, Director
c.	Washington-Baltimore Campus	1709 New Hampshire Ave., N.W. Wash., DC 20009	Stephen Plumer, Dean
4.	Assoc. of World Colleges	18 W. 86th St., New York, NY 10024	Charles Penn, Exec. Secretary
		Westbury, NY 11590	Dr. Harvey Baty
5.	Austin College, Experimental College	Sherman, TX 75090	President
6.	Bakersfield State College, Experimental College	Bakersfield, CA 93309	Philip Wilder, Academic Vice President
7.	Ball State University	Muncie, IN 47306	Dr. Ron E. Galbraith
8.	Bank Street College of Education	610 W. 112th St. New York, NY 10025	John Neimeyer
9.	Bard College	Annandale-on-Hudson, NY 12504	Dr. Reamer Kline, President
10.	Bates College	Lewiston, ME 04240	President
11.	Beloit College Experimental College	Beloit, WI 53511	William L. Kolb, Prov. and Dean

---

* List compiled by Bernie Fiskin, Coordinator of Off-Campus Programs, Johnston College, Redlands, California, 92373 (714) 793-2121, Ext. 486.

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
12.	Bennington College	Bennington, VT 05201	Dr. Edward Bloustein, Pres.
13.	Berea College	Berea, KY 40403	Dr. Conrad Hilberry
14.	Blake College	200 N. Jefferson St. Eugene, OR 97402	Raymond Blake
15.	Bloomfield College	Bloomfield, NY 07003	John Huntoon, Dir., Cont. Ed.; Dr. Merle T. Allshouse, Pres.; Dr. Martha Stadt, Asst. Dean
16.	Boston Univ., College of Basic Studies	871 Commonwealth Ave. Boston, MA 02215	Dean Horacio M. LaFauci
17.	Bowling Green State Univ.	Bowling Green, OH 43403	Gary A. Woditsch, Asst. to Provost
18.	Brandeis University Experimental College	Waltham, MA 02154	Dean Leo Trietler
19.	Brooklyn College, Experimental College	Brooklyn, NY 11210	President
20.	Calif. College of Arts and Crafts	5212 Broadway Oakland, CA 94618	Pres. Harry Ford
21.	Calif. Institute of the Arts	21700 McBean Parkway Valencia, CA 91355	Dr. Donald C. Biggs; Alan Kaprow, Assoc. Dean; Jan McClain; Albert Cruse; Julia Hirsch
22.	Calif. State College System	5670 Wilshire Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90036	Robert Bess, Dir. Spec. Projects; Gerhard Friedrich, Dean of Acad. Plan.; John M. Smart
	a. Calif. State Univ., Dominguez Hills	100 E. Victoria St. Dominguez Hills, CA 90246	Robert M. Bersi; Evelyn Childress
	b. Calif. State Univ., Fresno	Fresno, CA 93710	Vice Pres. for Acad. Affairs
	c. Calif. State Univ., San Bernardino	5500 State Coll. Parkway San Bernardino, CA 92407	Fred Roach, Dean of Cont. Educ.; Charles F. Keller; Gerald Scherba; Roger Schmidt; David Lawrence; Steve Hardin
	d. Calif. State Univ., San Diego	San Diego, CA 92115	Kenneth K. Jones
	e. Calif. State University, San Francisco	1600 Holloway San Francisco, CA 94132	Donna Goddard, Dir.
	f. Calif. State University, San Jose, New College	125 S. 7th San Jose, CA 95114	Dr. Harold J. DeBey, Provost
23.	Campus-Free College	Box 161, Arlington, MA 02174	Armand Henault, Jr.

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
24.	Carlton College	Northfield, MN 55057	Larry Litton
25.	Catholic Univ. of America	Washington, DC 20017	Bro. Columbian Conway, Executive Asst. to Pres.
26.	Center for Educational Reform	2115 S. State, SW Washington, DC 20008	Larry Magid
27.	Central New York Consortium for the External Degree	723 University Ave. Syracuse, NY 13210	Mr. Francis Macy, Exec. Dir.
28.	Change Magazine	59 E. 54th St. New York, NY 10022	Edwin Keister, Jr.
29.	Chicago State College	6800 S. Steward Chicago, IL 60621	Dr. Norman Somers, Dir. of Educ. Experimentation
30.	Chicago State University	Chicago, IL 60621	Frederick Blum
31.	Cleveland State Univ.	Cleveland, OH 44115	John Chase, Dir. Coop. Ed.
32.	Coker College	Hartsville, SC 29550	Edwin G. Speir, Jr., Dean William Floyd
33.	Colby College, Center for Coord. Studies	Waterville, ME 04901	Howard Koonce, Dir.
34.	College of the Americas	105 W. Gonzalez St. Pensacola, FL 32501	Earl W. Newton, Acting President
35.	College of DuPage, Alpha One	680 Duane Glen Ellyn, IL 60137	Pres. Rodney Berg
36.	College of Human Resources	807 Forestry Tower Morgantown, WV 02139	President or Lynn K. Rainey; Guy Renzaglia
37.	College for Human Services	201 Varick St. New York, NY 10014	Audry Cohen, Exec. Dir.
38.	College of Marin	Kentfield, CA 94904	President
39.	College of the Potomac	2534 K. St., N.W. Washington, DC 20037	Pres. James Russell; Prov. Jim Arend
40.	Colorado Mt. College	Glenwood Springs, CO 81601	John Wubben, Inst. Coord.
41.	Colorado Outward Bound	Denver, CO 80210	Craig Hafner
42.	Colorado State Univ.	Ft. Collins, CO 80521	Frank J. Vattano, Asst. Acad. V. P.
43.	Columbia College	Chicago, IL 60600	Dr. Louis Silverstein, Dean
44.	Columbia University, Barnard-Colum. Exper. Coll.	Broadway & W. 119th New York, NY 10027	President
45.	Commonwealth Univ.	Richmond, VA 23219	President

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
46.	Community Development Foundation	345 E. 46th St. New York, NY 10017	Frank Dobyns
47.	Concordia Sr. College	Ft. Wayne, IN 46825	President
48.	Cornell University	Ithaca, NY 14850	W. Jack Lewis
49.	Cranbrook Academy	Bloomfield Hill, MY 48013	Wallace Mitchell, Pres.
50.	Dartmouth College, Experimental College	Hanover, NY 03755	President
51.	D.Q. University	Davis, CA 95616	Jose de la Isla, Exec. Dir.
52.	Drake University Experimental College	Des Moines, IA 50311	President
53.	Duke University, Share	Durham, NC 27706	Dr. John M. Clum, 1138 Wilson House.
54.	East Carolina University, Coll. of Arts & Sciences	Greenville, NC 27834	Dawyer D. Gross, Dept. of Philosophy
55.	Educational Testing Serv.	Princeton, NJ 08540	John Summerskill; John R. Valley
	a. Office of New Degree Programs c/o College Entrance Examination Board	888 Seventh Ave. New York, NY 10019	Fred A. Nelson
56.	Elmhurst College	190 Prospect Elmhurst, IL 60126	Chap. Robert D. Schieler
57.	Evergreen State College	Olympia, WA 98501	Charles Teske; Prov. David Berry; Karen Core
58.	Federal City College	Washington, DC 20001	Mrs. Alicia Young, Office of Exper. Prgorams; Barbara Benavie
59.	Findlay College	Findlay, OH 45840	Pres. Ivan E. Frick
60.	Florida Atlantic Univ.	Boca Raton, FL 33432	Robert Stetson, Dir. of Scholars Program; Jo Ellen Geisel; K. M. Michel
61.	Florida Presbyterian College	Jefferson House 34th St. & 54th Ave. S St. Petersburg, FL 33733	Dean John Jacobson
62.	Florida State University Cluster Program & Flex	Tallahassee, FL 32306	B. G. Vanderhill, Dir.
63.	Foothill College, Experimental College	12345 El Monte Los Altos, CA 94022	President
64.	Fordham University, Bensalem College	Bronx, NY 10458	Jean Adleman Mahoney; Cassie Durant

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
65.	Ft. Lauderdale International University	Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33300	Homer D. Ledbetter, V. P. Academic Affairs
66.	Franconia College	Franconia, NY 03580	Pres. Leon Botstein
67.	Franklin & Marshall College	Lancaster, PA 17604	Stanley Michelak
68.	Friends World College	Mitchell Gardens Westbury, NY 11590	James E. Truex, VP; Robin Hodgkinson; David Carlson
69.	General Electric Fdn.	1285 Boston Ave. Bridgeport CT 06602	Edmund Tucker
70.	Georgetown University	Washington, DC 20007	Andrew Duncan
71.	Goddard College a. Goddard-West Coast Community	Plainfield, VT 05667 955 S. Western Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90006	Pres. Gerald Witherspoon; Melvin Suhd; Jane Ann Pullen
72.	Golden Gate College	San Francisco, CA 94105	Pres. Dr. Otto W. Butz
73.	Golden West College	15744 Golden West St. Huntington Beach, CA 92647	Pres. R. Dudley Boyce
74.	Goshen College	Goshen, IN 46526	Paul Mininger, Center for Study of Christian Higher Study
75.	Goucher College Experimental College	Baltimore, MD 21204	President
76.	Governor's State Univ.	Park Forest S., IL 60466	Pres. Dr. Wm. E. Engbretson; Larry A. McClellan
77.	Grand Valley State Coll. a. Wm. James Coll. b. Thom. Jefferson Coll.	Allendale, MI 49401	John McTavish; Hugh Haggard; Dan T. Gilmore, Dean; Don Klein; Roxanne Harley
78.	Grinnell College Experimental College	Grinnell, IA 50112	Glen Leggett
79.	Hamilton College Kirkland College	Clinton, NY 13323	Pres. John W. Chandler
80.	Hampshire College	Amherst, MA 01002	Dean Richard C. Lyon; Ronna Kabatznick; Robert Von der Lippe
81.	Harvard University Experimental College	Cambridge, MA 02138	President
82.	Heidelberg College	Tiffin, OH 44883	Pastor Wm. F. Hobbs
83.	Hofstra University		
	a. New College	Hempstead, NY 11550	Dean David C. Christman; Howard Lord
	b. Center for the Study of Higher Education	Hempstead, NY 11550	Dr. Harold E. Yuker

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
84.	Hope College, Experimental College	Holland, MI 49423	President
85.	Mark Hopkins College	61 Western Ave. Brattleboro, VT 05301	Pres. Dr. Walter Hendricks
86.	Howard University-UWW	Box 662, 2401 Sixth, N.W Washington, DC 20001	Anita Hackney, Dir.
87.	Humboldt College, Experimental College	Arcata, CA 95521	President
88.	Illinois State University	Normal, IL 61761	Stan Rives, Assoc. Dean
89.	Immaculate Heart Coll.	Los Angeles, CA 90027	Pres. Helen Kelley; Esther Ballard; Sr. Mary Gerald Shea
90.	Indiana State University	Terre Haute, IN 47809	Dr. Walter J. Hipple, Dept. of Humanities
91.	Indiana University, Living-Learning Center	Bloomington, IN 47401	Dr. I. Don Bell, Dir.
92.	International Community College	1019 Gayley Ave. Westwood Village Los Angeles, CA 90024	Gary Filosa, Dean of Special Programs
93.	Interstate Educational Resource Serv. Center	Stansbury Bldg. 710 E. Second So. Salt Lake City, UT 84102	Dr. Albert R. Wight, Assoc. Dir.; James Doxsey
94.	Kalamazoo College	Kalamazoo, MI 49001	Pres. Weimer K. Hicks
95.	Kansas State University, University for Man	615 Fairchild Terr. Manhattan, KS 66502	Sue C. Maes
96.	Kauai Community Coll.	Rt. 1, Box 216 Lihue, HI 96766	President
97.	Kent State University	Kent, OH 44240	Raymond Broaddus,
	a. Akron Neighborhood Faculty Program		Wesley C. Zaynor, Assoc. Dean
	b. Honors & Exper. Coll.		
98.	Knox College Experimental College	Galesburg, IL 61401	President
99.	Lake Erie College	Painesville, OH 44077	Pres. Paul Weaver
100.	Lake Forest College	Lake Forest, IL 60045	Chap. Wm. Charland
101.	LaVerne College	1950 Third St. LaVerne, CA 91750	Pres. Leland Newcomer; William B. Relf; Rodney Davis
102.	Lehigh University	Bethlehem, PA 18015	Dr. Eric V. Ottervik, VP

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
103.	Lewis and Clark College	Portland, OR 97219	John E. Brown, Dean of Faculty; John F. Hart; Cal Scott
104.	Lincoln College	Lincoln, IL 62656	Ella Pascale, Dept. of Socio.
105.	Loma Linda University	La Sierra Campus Riverside, CA 92505	Willard H. Meier; Fritz Guy
106.	Lone Mountain College	2800 Turk Blvd. San Francisco, CA 94118	Fred Hudson, Acad. Dean; Greg McAllister; Alan Plum
107.	Loretto Heights College (UWW)	3001 S. Federal Blvd. Denver, CO 80236	Ronald C. Hayes; Mike Reynolds; Brigid McCaw
108.	Loyola Univ. of L.A.	7101 W. 80th St. Los Angeles, CA 90045	Carol Sullivan, Asst. Dean of College of Lib. Arts.
109.	Macalaster College Inner College	St. Paul, MN 55101	Jack Rossman
110.	Malcolm X Comm. Coll.	Chicago, IL 60625	President
111.	Mankato State College	P. O. Box 80 Mankato, MN 56001	R. V. VanderWilt, Exper. Studies Program
112.	Marlboro College	Marlboro, VT 05344	President
113.	Mars Hill College	Mars Hill, NC 28754	Fred Bentley
114.	Medaille College	18 Agassiz Circle Buffalo, NY 14214	Pres. Sr. Alice Huber
115.	Miami Dade Jr. College Exper. College	Miami, FL 33167	President
116.	Michigan State Univ. a. Lyman Briggs Coll. b. James Madison Coll. c. Justin Morrill Coll.	E - 29 Holmes Hall E - 29 Holmes Hall E - 29 Holmes Hall	Fred Dutton, Dean; Gary Frost; Milton J. Powell; Gordon Rohman; Paul Dressel
117.	Minnesota Metropolitan State College	421 N. Wabash St. Paul, MN 55102	Douglas R. Moore, VP
118.	Monmouth College Exper. College	Monmouth, IL 61462	President
119.	Morgan State College (UWW)	Cold Spring Lane & Hillen Road Baltimore, MD 21239	Mrs. Argentine Craig; Gwendolyn Cooke; Ibitoye Fakenlede
120.	Morningside College	Sioux City IA 51106	President
121.	Harvey Mudd College	Claremont, CA 91711	Tad A. Beckman; Arnold M. Ruskin; Jonathan Mersel
122.	Mt. Vernon College	2100 Foxhall Rd., NW Washington, DC 20007	President

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
123.	Nairobi College	1627 Bay Road E. Palo Alto, CA 94303	Bob Hoover, Dir.
124.	Nasson College	Springvale, ME 04083	Pres. John S. Bailey
125.	Nat. Council of Churches of Christ	475 Riverside Dr. New York, NY 10027	President
126.	New College, Society for Educ. Ventures, Inc.	P. O. Box 48 Alfred, ME 04002	President
127.	New College	Box 1898 Sarasota, FL 33578	President's Office, James Feeney, O/C Coord.
128.	New School of Social Research	66 W. 12th Street New York, NY 10011	Pres. John R. Everett
129.	New York Univ. UWW	Washington Square New York, NY 10003	Herb London; Diane Giacolone
130.	Newark State College	Union, NJ 07083	M. G. Frankel
131.	Newton College of the Sacred Heart, Experimental College	Newton, MA 02158	President
132.	Northeastern Illinois State College	Bryn Mawr at St. Louis Ave. Chicago, IL 60625	Dr. Robert Goldberg, VP. for Academic Affairs; William Moore, Director for Program Development
133.	Northeastern University	360 Huntington Avenue Boston, MA 02115	President
134.	Northern Arizona Univ.	Flagstaff, AZ 86001	Dr. Leon B. Pollada, So. Academic Center; James R. Brathode
135.	Nova University	Ft. Lauderdale, FL	Pres. Dr. Abraham Fischler
136.	Oakland University		
	a. Allport College	Rochester, MI 48063	Carl Vann, Fac. Chm.;
	b. Charter College	Rochester, MI 48063	Alfred Lessing, Fac. Chm.;
	c. New College	Rochester, MI 48063	Jim Clatworthy; R. L. Stern
137.	Oberlin College Experimental College	Oberlin, OH 44074	Daniel Merrill, Assoc. Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
138.	Occidental College	Los Angeles, CA 90041	Jim McManus, Box 256
139.	Ohio State University	Columbus, OH 43200	Dr. Lloyd R. Evans
140.	Ohio University Extended Learning Program	Athens, OH 45701	Richard C. Dorf, Chrmn., Comm. on the Extended University
141.	Olivet College Experimental College	Olivet, MI 49076	President

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
142.	Ohio Wesleyan Univ. Experimental College	Delaware, OH 43015	President
143.	Pacific University	Forest Grove, OR 97116	Brock Dixon
144.	Penn State University Experimental College	University Park, PA 16802	Leslie P. Greenhill, V.P. Academic Services
145.	Pikeville College, Exper.	Pikeville, KY 41501	President
146.	Pitzer College	Claremont, CA 91711	Alan J. Greenberger
147.	Pomona College	Claremont, CA 91311	Lee C. McDonald, Dean; Rick Judd; James D. Likens
148.	Prescott College	Prescott, AZ 86301	President
	a. The Institute	Prescott, AZ 86301	Lee Maynard;
	b. The Schole	Prescott, AZ 86301	Jim Stuckey; James Bickerwood
149.	Princeton University	403 W. College Princeton, NJ 08540	Dr. Edward D. Sullivan
150.	Psychological Services Assoc.	1314 Westwood Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90024	Thomas C. Greening
151.	Purdue University	LaFayette, IN 47907	Ronald T. Effron, Soc. Dept.
152.	Queens College Experimental College	Flushing, NY 11367	President
153.	Reed College	3203 S.E. Woodstock Portland, Oregon 97201	Alan Walworth
154.	Renison College	Waterloo, Ontario, Can.	A. W. Reese, V. Chairman
155.	Rio Hondo College, Exploratory College	3600 Workman Mill Rd. Whittier, CA 90608	George W. Juric, Dir.; Kenneth Knowlton; Sally Lansburg
156.	Riverside City College	3650 Fairfax Riverside, CA 92506	E. Paul Williams
157.	Rochdale College Experiment in Educ.	341 Bloor St. West Toronto, Ont., Canada	President
158.	Rochester Center for Theological Studies	Rochester, NY 16402	R. Melvin Henderson, Dean of Acad. Admin.
159.	Rockland Comm. College	Suffern, NY 10901	Richard Connolly
160.	Roger Williams College Experimental College	266 Pine Street Providence, RI 02903	Edwin F. Hallenbeck, VP; Robert J. Leaver UWW Proj.
161.	Rollins College	Box 106 Winter Park, FL 32789	George T. Cochran
162.	Rutgers University Livingston College	New Brunswick, NJ 08903	Ernest A. Lynton, Dean

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
163.	Saginaw Valley College	University Center, MI 48710	Prof. Curt McCray
164.	St. Edwards University	Austin, TX 78700	President
165.	St. John's College		
	a. Annapolis	Annapolis, MD 21404	Provost, Paul Newland
	b. Santa Fe	Camino de Cruz Blanca Santa Fe, NM 87501	President Richard Weigle
166.	St. John's University	Collegeville, MN 56321	President
167.	St. Lawrence University	Canton, NY 13617	Priscilla Angelo Assoc. Dir. of Student Serv.
168.	St. Mary's College of Maryland	St. Mary's City, MD	Daniel R. Macgilveray
169.	St. Olaf College, Paracollege	Northfield, MN 55057	Dr. David Wee, Sr. Fellow; Paul Froman; Anne Hall; Gretchen Steinhoff
170.	St. Xavier College Experimental College	103 R. & Central Park Chicago, IL 60655	President
171.	San Francisco City Coll. Experimental Coll.	50 Phelan St. San Francisco, CA 94112	President
172.	Sangaman State Univ.	Springfield, IL 62701	Pres. Robert G. Spencer
173.	Sarah Lawrence College, Experimental College	Bronxville, NY 10708	Pres. Charles De Carlo
174.	School for International Training	Brattleboro, VT 05301	President
175.	Scripps College	Claremont, CA 91711	Pres; Mark Curtis; Stephanie Adams; Margaret Faust; Barbara Berry; Lois Langland
176.	Shaw University	Raleigh, NC 27602	Pres. J. Archie Hargraves
177.	Shimer College Experimental College	Mt. Corroll, IL 61053	President
178.	Simon Fraser University	Burnaby 2, B.C. Canada	R. C. Brown
179.	Simon's Rock College	Great Barrington, MA 01230	Clarence Leeds III. Dean of Faculty
180.	Skidmore College	Saratoga Springs, NY 12866	Dr. Mark Gelber, UWW
181.	Slippery Rock State College	Slippery Rock, PA 16057	Judson W. Hall, Soc. Dept.
182.	Sonoma State College		
	a. Hutchins School	Rohnert Park, CA 94928	Warren Olson, Prov.; Lee Mattson; Lynn Clark;
	b. School of Expressive Arts	Rohnert Park, CA 94928	Barbara Boelter; Terry Cadigan; Mark Collin

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
183.	Southern Illinois Univ. College of Human Resources Development	Carbondale, IL 62901	Cricket Levering; Joseph Barr; Robert Child, Coordinator for Planning & Development; H. F. Wm. Perk; Walter Robinson
184.	Stanford University	Palo Alto, CA 94305	Frank Newman, Dir. of Community Relations; Vic Baldridge
185.	Staten Island Community College	715 Ocean Terrace Staten Island, NY 10301	Dr. Felix F. Cardegna, Dean of Experimenting Prgm.
186.	Stephens College Experimental College	Columbia, MO 65201	Pres. Dr. Seymour Smith
187.	Stout State University	Menomonie, WI 54751	Eugene Flug, Asst. to Pres.
188.	Strategies for [illegible]nge	Saratoga Springs, NY	Jack Lindquist
189.	State U. of N.Y.		
	a. Empire State College	Thurlow Terrace Albany, NY 12203	Dr. Robert R. Wright, Dir., Off. of Inst. Research;
	b. SUNY Buffalo	133 Crosby Hall Buffalo, NY 14214	Dr. Wayland P. Smith, Dir.; Keith Klopp, Asst to Dir.
	c. SUNY College of Cortland	Cortland, NY 13045	Morris R. Bogard, Assoc. to VP.
	d. SUNY College at Old Westbury	Old Westbury, NY 11658	Pres. John D. McGuire
	e. SUNY at Stoneybrook	Stoneybrook, NY 11790	Marvin Kalkstein
190.	Swarthmore College	Swarthmore, PA 19081	Charles G. Gilbert, Provost
191.	Syracuse University	Syracuse, NY 13210	Dr. David L. Dresser, Asst. Provost; Frances U. Macy
192.	Temple University, Messiah College	Broad St. & Montgomery Ave. Philadelphia PA 19122	Pres. Paul R. Anderson
193.	Texas Christian Univ.	University Drive Ft. Worth, TX 76129	James Moudy, Chancellor
194.	Tufts University	Medford, MA 02155	Pres. Burton C. Hallowell; Seymour Simches, Director;
	a. College Within	Medford, MA 02155	Jasper Rosenmeier; John Fensterwald
	b. Experimental College	Medford, MA 02155	Harry Ritchie, Director
195.	Tusculum College	Greenville, TN 37743	Pres. Andrew N. Cothran
196.	Union College	Schenectady, NY 12308	Patrick Allen, Eng. Dept.
197.	Union for Exper. Coll.	Yellow Springs, OH 45387	Pres. Samuel Baskin
198.	Union Theological Seminary	Broadway at 120th St. New York, NY 10027	William E. Barrick, Field Education Office
199.	USIU Elliot Campus	San Diego, CA 92124	Jeanne Denon

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
200.	U. S. Office of Education	400 Maryland SW Washington, DC 20202	Dick Hays; Donald Crawford
201.	University of Alabama		
	a. New College	P. O. Box 6211 University, AL 35486	Dr. Neal Berte, Dean
	b. Inst. of Higher Ed. Research & Services	P. O. Box 6211 University, AL 35486	Thomas J. Diener, Dir.
202.	Universidad de Aztlan	410 N. Yosemite Fresno, CA 93701	Alberto Nieto, Coord.; Carlos Hernandez; Steven J. Solano
203.	University of California		
	a. Center for Research & Dev.	Berkeley, CA 94720	Harold Hodgkinson;
	b. U.C. Davis-Exper. College	Davis, CA 95616	Seth Brunner, Assoc. Dir.; Scott Wren, Dir.
	c. U.C. Irvine-Exper. College	Irvine, CA 92664	President
	d. U.C.L.A.	Los Angeles, CA 90024	Bill Thomas; Robert Ringler; Robert Pace; Carol Adams; Craig Fuller; Judd Adams; Linda Adams; Alexander White; Dave Peters;
	e. U.C. Riverside-Div. Undergrad. Studies	Riverside, CA 92502	Dean Mack Thompson; Michael Zimmerman;
	f. U.C. San Diego	La Jolla, CA 92037	William McElroy, Chancellor; Paul Saltman;
	1. John Muir College	La Jolla, CA 92037	Jim Beckley; P. J. Ledder,
	2. Third College	P. O. Box 109	Acad. VP; Joseph Watson, Prov.;
	g. U.C. Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz, CA 95060	Lloyd J. Ring; Robert Kramarz; Michael Kahn;
	1. College 5	Santa Cruz, CA 95060	James Hall, Prov.;
	2. Cowell College	Santa Cruz, CA 95060	Jasper Rose, Prov.;
	3. Crown College	Santa Cruz, CA 95060	Stephen Toulmin, Pro.;
	4. Kresge College	Santa Cruz, CA 95060	Dr. Robert Edgar, Prov.;
	5. Merrill College	Santa Cruz, CA 95060	John Marcum, Prov.;
	6. Stevenson College	Santa Cruz, CA 95060	F. M. Glenn Wilson, Prov.;
	7. College VII	Santa Cruz, CA 95060	J. Herman Blake, Act. Prov.;
	8. College VIII	Santa Cruz, CA 95060	Stanley Cain, Chrmn. Organizing Committee
204.	University of Chicago New College Division	5811 S. Ellis Ave. Chicago, IL 60637	Charles W. Wegner
205.	University of Cincinnati	Cincinnati, OH 45221	Paul Burral
206.	University of Colorado	Boulder, CO 80302	Frederick Thieme, Pres.; Lawrence Silverman, V.P.
	a. Colorado Springs Campus	Colorado, Springs 80903	President
207.	University of Connecticut Inner College (U-54)	Storrs, CT 06268	Pres. Homer D. Babbige; Dr. Glenn C. Atkyns

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
208.	University of Dayton	P.O. Box 35 Dayton, OH 45409	James N. Nesmith, Asst. Pro.
	a. Project Interface	Box 154 Dayton, OH 45409	Director
209.	University of Delaware	Newark, DE 19711	Barry R. Morstain
210.	University of Denver	University Park Denver, CO 80210	Robert Cogan, Asst. Dean, Housing Program
211.	University of Evansville	Box 329 Evansville, IN 47701	Larry Jackson, Provost
212.	University of Florida	Gainesville, FL 32601	Dr. Clarence Derrick
213.	University of Hawaii New College	2001 Vancouver Drive Honolulu, HI 96822	Dr. Richard Rapson, Dir.
214.	University of Illinois	Champaign, IL 61820	Alan Purves, Dir.;
	a. Unit I	Urbana, IL 61801	Dr. W. M. Plater
215.	University of Iowa	Iowa City, IA 52240	Dr. Philip G. Hubbard; Sue Burden; Lowell Schoer
216.	University of Kansas	Lawrence, KS 66044	E. Lawrence Chalmers, Chan.;
	a. College within the College		Jerry Lewis, Exec. Dir.
217.	University of Kentucky UYA Program	Rm. 303 Adm. Bldg. Lexington, KY 40506	Dr. Anthony Colson, Dir.
218.	University of Maine		
	a. Abenaki Exper. Coll.	Orono, ME 05573	Philip Spalding; Harold Gradinsky;
	b. Portland-Gorham	96 Falmouth Street Portland, ME 04103	Dr. George Connick
219.	University of Maryland	College Park, MD 20742	Mrs. Margaret Bonz
220.	University of Mass.	Amherst, MA 01002	Dr. Dwight Allan, Dean, School of Educ., Pat Crossner, Prov. Off.; Thomas Clark, UWW
	a. Orchard Hill Res. Coll.	Amherst, MA 01002	Leon Barron;
	b. Southwest Res. Coll. (proj. 10)	Amherst, MA 01002	Charles Adams, Dir.
221.	University of Michigan		
	a. Cntr. for Research on Learning & Teaching	109 E. Madison Ann Arbor, MI 48104	Prof. Donald Brown
	b. Residential College	Ann Arbor, MI 48104	Theodore Newcomb
222.	University of Minnesota Living Learning Center	1425 University Avenue SE Minneapolis, MN 55414	President
223.	University of Missouri	Columbia, MO 65201	Clifton Cornwell, Dean; Wm. Bonderson;
	a. U. Mo. at Kansas City	Kansas City, MO 64110	Robert J. Darak, Asst. Dir.

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
224.	University of Nebraska Centennial Educ. Pgrm.	540 N. 16th St. Lincoln, NB 68508	Dr. T. E. Beck; Dr. Scott Morgan; Lawrence Freeman
225.	Univ. of New Hampshire Experimental Program	Durham, NH 03284	Mr. Robbie Freid, Life Studies
226.	Univ. of No. Carolina	Chapel Hill, NC 27514	Prof. Peter Filens; Robert Voight, Dir.;
	a. Experimental College	Chapel Hill, NC 27514	President
	b. Residential College	Greensboro, NC 27412	James Ferguson, Chan.;
	c. Experimental Univ.	Greensboro, NC 27412	President
227.	Univ. of North Dakota Center for Teaching & Learning	Grand Forks, ND 58201	Vito Perrone, Dean; Ivan Dahl, Program Coord.
228.	Univ. of Northern Iowa	Cedar Falls, IA 50613	John Volker, Coord.; Mary Kay Eakin
229.	University of Oklahoma, Center for Studies in Higher Educ.	820 Van Vleet St. Norman, OK 73069	Herbert Heigst, Dir.
230.	University of Oregon a. Beachhead College b. Consumer Rights Research Center	Eugene, OR 97403	Dr. John Wish, Director; Phillip Grant
231.	University of the Pacific	Stockton, CA 95204	Dr. Alistar McCrone;
	a. Callison College	Stockton, CA 95204	Dr. Reuben Smith III, Prov.;
	b. Elbert Covell College	Stockton, CA 95204	Dr. Gaylon Caldwell, Prov.;
	c. Raymond College	Stockton, CA 95204	Berndt Kolker; Andy Key; Barbara Morrison
232.	University of Penn. UYA Proj.	101 Sergeant Phil., PA 19104	Andrew Sullivan, Coord.
233.	University of Redlands, Johnston College	Redlands, CA 92373	Eugene Ouellette, Chancellor; Ed Williams, Vice Chancellor; Heidi Dressler; John Ruark; Sarah Lilly; Bernie Fisken; Dan Gilbertson; Susan Phillips; Michele Spino; Allen Killpatrick; Shirley Cox; Cherrie Cox; Steve Jump; Al Jones; Jim Kurzmack; Hugh Redmond; Rustee McCain; Yasuyuki Owada; Pat Aguirre; Frank Blume; Rose Shalom; Lee Jones; Faith Beckett; Dick Larsen; Peter Newell; Isobel Cornell; Marc Heydon; Rosemary Galli; Nancy Jo Garretson; Vishwanath More; Pam Cortelyou; Glenn Whitlock

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
			Donna Lescoe; Roger Baty; Gayle Treacy; Kevin O'Neill; Chris Meikle; Doug Bowman; Chris Currier; George Rupp; Larry Tonar; Dave Bragg; Karen Carlquist; Walter Tubbs; Vicki Barr; Bill McDonald; Kate Higgins; Phil Smith; Rich Ellis; Rick Sullivan; Arthur McKenny; Debbie Sattler; Barbara Weber; Lori Howard; Jim McFarland; Naomi Tenen; Pete Broffman; Carol Ann Brusven; Don Cash; Carey Marvin; Bion Howard; Debbie Chandler; Julie Merrill; Tenzing Chodak; Michael D. Massengale; Karen Peterson; Cindy Williams; Lee Jones
234.	Univ. of Rhode Island	Kingston, RI 02881	President
235.	University of Scranton, Experimental College	Scranton, PA 18510	President
236.	Univ. of So. Carolina	Columbia, SC 29208	Dr. Warren Buford, UWW
237.	Univ. of So. Florida	Tampa, FL 33600	Ray King
238.	University of Tennessee a. U of T at Chattanooga	Knoxville, TN 37916 Chattanooga, TN 37402	Dr. Oliver Milton; Donald S. Klinefelter; Thomas Richards
239.	University of Texas	Austin, TX 78700	Stephen H. Spurr
240.	University of Toronto	97 St. George St. Toronto 181, Ont. Canada	James Bookbinder; G. B. Payzant
241.	University of Utah	Salt Lake City, UT 84112	Lori Clarke
242.	University of Vermont a. College of Technology b. Experimental Program	Burlington, VT 05401	Donald C. Gregg, Chem. Dept.; Jon Fackler, Dir.
243.	University of Washington Experimental	205 Hub Seattle, WA 98105 Waterloo, Ont., Canada	Dr. Thomas F. Hodgson
244.	University of Waterloo a. Contrad Grebel Coll.	Waterloo, Ont., Canada	John E. Fauquier
245.	Univ. of Western Ontario Althouse Coll. of Educ.	London, N. Ont., Canada	Ernest Stabler, Dean
246.	University of Wisconsin a. Experimental College b. U.W. Green Bay	Madison, WI 53706 Green Bay, WI 54305	President E. Nelson Swinerton, Exec. Asst. to Chancellor James Kolka; Bud Harris

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
246.	University of Wisconsin (cont.)		
	c. U.W. Green Bay College of Creative Communications	120 S. Univ. Circle Dr. Green Bay, WI 54305	Prof. E. Michael Thron
	d. U.W. Milwaukee	Milwaukee, WI 53201	Frank Campenni; Bill Halloran
247.	University Without Walls	2700 Bancroft Berkeley, CA 94704	Dr. Malcolm McAfee
248.	Utica College	Utica, NY 13502	Dr. James Doremus, Dir. of Spec. Pgms. & Inst. Studies
249.	Vassar College, Exper. College	Poughkeepsie, NY 12601	President
250.	Vermont Regional Community College Commission	Box 81 Monteplier, VT 05602	President
251.	Wake Forest College, Experimental College	Winston-Salem, NC 27412	President
252.	Wartburg College	Waverly, IA 50677	Pres. John W. Bachman; Ronald Mattias, Dean of Fac.
253.	Washington International College	Wisc. & Woodley Rd., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20016	President
254.	Wayne State University Monteith College	5165 Second Ave - The Mall Detroit, MI 48202	Yates Hafner, Dean; Alfred Stern; Jay Vogelbaum
255.	Webster College, Experimental School	470 E. Lockwood Ave. St. Louis, MO 63119	President
256.	Wellesley College, Experimental College	Wellesley, MA 02181	President
257.	Wesleyan University		
	a. College of Letters	Middletown, CT 06457	Peter S. Boynton, Dir.
	b. College of Social Studies	Middletown, CT 06457	Eugene D. Golob, Co-Chm.
258.	Western Washington St.		
	a. Fairhaven College	Bellingham, WA 98225	Ken Freeman, Dean
	b. Huxley College	Bellingham, WA 98225	Gene Miller, Dean; Charles Flore;
	c. College of Ethnic Studies	Bellingham, WA 98225	Sergio D. Elizondo, Dean; Jack Rand
259.	Westminster College	Fulton, MO 65251	Dr. Gale Fuller, Dean
260.	Whitman College	Walla Walla, WA 99362	Corie J. Muse, Educ. Dept.
261.	Whitworth College	Spokane, WA 99218	David K. Winter, Dean of Fac.
262.	Windham College	Putney, VT 05346	Pres. Eugene C. Winslow

NO.	INSTITUTION	ADDRESS	CONTACT
263.	Wisconsin State Univ.	Whitewater, WI 53190	Charles B. Varney
264.	World College West	P.O. Box 3060 San Rafael, CA 94902	Richard M. Gray
265.	Wright Institute	2728 Durant Ave. Berkeley, CA 94704	Nevitt Sanford, Exec. Dir.; Arthur Weiner; Mr. & Mrs. J. R. Bartlett
266.	Youngstown State Univ.	Youngstown, OH 44503	Dr. Earl E. Edgar, V.P.
267.	Xavier University	Victory Parkway Cincinnati, OH 45207	Dr. Roger A. Fortin, Assoc. Prof. of History; Daniel W. Costello

"WE ARE NOW IN A TEST PERIOD. THE QUESTION IS WHETHER WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO SHOW THE IMAGINATION NECESSARY TO DEVELOP NEW APPROACHES, THE WILLINGNESS TO SET HIGH STANDARDS, AND THE DISCIPLINE TO EVALUATE OUR EXPERIMENTAL EFFORTS AGAINST THESE STANDARDS."

. . . from the Foreword by *FRANK NEWMAN*

This document is a report resulting from the Johnston College National Symposium on Experimental Higher Education in January, 1972. A second symposium is planned for January, 1973.